Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-125
Friday
28 June 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-125 *28 June 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Holds Press Briefing 1
Churkin News Briefing *[TASS]* 1
Progress in Khmer Talks Hailed *[TASS]* 1
'Satisfaction' With Iraqi-Kurdish Talks *[TASS]* 1
Landing of Aircraft in Thailand *[TASS]* 2
Agreement With PRC Discussed *[TASS]* 2
Moscow Mandarin on PRC Border *[Moscow International]* 2
Foreign Ministry To Discuss Replacing CEMA *[INTERFAX]* 3
Ignatenko Briefing on Gorbachev, G-7 Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 3
Role in Asia-Pacific Region Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 3
Soviet, International Terrorism Surveyed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Report on Pirating of U.S. Films *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 11
Matlock Cited on Ties to Republics *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 8 Jun]* 11
Yeltsin Visit to AFL-CIO Reported *[TRUD 22 Jun]* 12

Northeast Asia

Soviet-Japanese Peace Negotiations Start in Tokyo 12
Rogachev Arrives, Meets Foreign Minister *[TASS]* 12
Peace Treaty, Cambodia on Agenda *[Moscow International]* 13
Commentary on Negotiations *[Moscow International]* 13
Japan To Restrict Travel to Kuriles *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Jun]* 13
Reorganization of U.S. Unit at Misawa Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Observer Assesses Outcome of Phatthaya Meeting *[Moscow International]* 14
Authorities Fail To Clarify Source of AN-2's *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 15
Soviet Planes Allowed to Continue Flight to Laos *[TASS]* 15

Near East & South Asia

Iraqi Position on UN Inspections Analyzed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 15
Nuclear Inspection Refusal Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 16
Gorbachev Sends Congratulations to India's Rao *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 16

East Europe

Vremya Warns of 'Terrible Explosion' in SFRY *[Moscow TV]* 17
Last Soviet Soldier Leaves CSFR *[TASS]* 17
Bulgarian President Comments on USSR Relations *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]* 17
Walesa Interviewed on Situation in Poland *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 26 May]* 18

West Europe

Pavlov Continues Visit to Austria 20
Meets Chancellor Vranitzky *[TASS]* 20
Vranitzky Hosts Dinner *[TASS]* 20
Discusses Economic Cooperation *[TASS]* 21
Kohl Receives Velichko in Bonn *[TASS]* 21
Correspondent Said To Seek Asylum in West *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 21
Report on European TV Project Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 22
Greek CP Leader Interviewed on Visit to Moscow *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 22

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Committee Discusses Dacha Costs for Elite *[Moscow Radio]* 24

Political & Social

Yakovlek Denies Attempt To Split Party *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 Jun]* 24
Officials on Possible New Party, CPSU Split *[Moscow Russian TV]* 25
Shevardnadze Interviewed on CPSU Investigation *[NOVOYE VREMYA No. 25]* 25
CPSU Concerned About Weakening Position *[TASS]* 27
Pre-CPSU Congress Maneuvers Assessed *[Moscow Russian TV]* 27
CPSU Discusses Neighborhood Political Work *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 27
Early Publication of Draft CPSU Program Urged *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 28
No Date Set for Congress of People's Deputies *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Deputies Said Concerned About Post-Treaty Future *[ROSSISKAYA GAZETA 26 Jun]* 28
Novo-Ogarevo Process, Privatization Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 28
Deputy Argues Against Abolition of Congress *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 30
Role of Constitutional Oversight Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 30
Gorbachev Meets Moscow Patriarch Aleksey II *[TASS]* 32
Completion of Oil Deal With Chevron Doubted *[INTERFAX]* 32
KGB Staffer Responds to Query on Bodyguards *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 32
Poll Shows Mixed Feelings About Patriotic War *[INTERFAX]* 33
TASS Reviews 28 Jun Press *[TASS]* 33

Economic

Gorbachev Issues Decree on Currency Resources *[Moscow TV]* 35
'Victimized' Miners on Underground Hunger Strike *[Moscow TV]* 35
Background to Commodities Exchange Scandal Cited *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 35
Ministers Debate Privatization Process *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 25 Jun]* 37

Agricultural

Weather, Crops Report for 10-20 Jun Published *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jun]* 38
Army Prepares To Help in Volga Grain Harvest *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 39
Shortages May Jeopardize Stavropol Kray Harvest *[Moscow TV]* 39
Metal Shortage Hampers Harvest Preparations *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 40

Military

Defense Council Discusses Armed Forces Problems *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Paper on Moiseyev Remarks to Staff Academy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 41
Army Communists on Socialist Choice, Ideology *[PRAVDA 25 Jun]* 41
Military Journalists Confer; Surkov Speaks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jun]* 42

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonia-USSR Delegations Hold Talks in Moscow 43
Official Previews Talks With Moscow *[Tallinn Radio]* 43
'Serious Conversation' Predicted *[Tallinn Radio]* 43
Pavlov Receives Savisaar *[Tallinn Radio]* 43
Military Issues Discussed *[Tallinn Radio]* 43
Communique Signed With Democratic Russia *[Tallinn Radio]* 44
Talks Produce 'Very Modest Results' *[TASS]* 44
Talks Termed 'Farce' *[BALTFAX]* 44
European Council Session Discusses Baltics *[Radio Vilnius]* 45
Ruutel Addresses Council *[BALTFAX]* 45
Further on OMON Telephone Exchange Seizure 46
Landsbergis Condemns 'Terrorist Act' *[Radio Vilnius]* 46
Gorbachev Kept Informed *[Berlin ADN]* 46
Gorbachev Orders Investigation *[Moscow TV]* 46
Lithuania Cables Doguzhiyev *[Radio Vilnius]* 46
Attack Could Be Prelude to Coup *[Radio Vilnius]* 46
Pugo Role in Seizure Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Vagnorius: 'No Justification' *[Radio Vilnius]* 48
Vagnorious Discusses Incident *[Radio Vilnius]* 49
MVD Official Explains Action *[TASS]* 49
OMON Official Comments *[Radio Rossii]* 49
Official Calls Attacks Provocative *[BALTFAX]* 50
Moscow Urged To Renounce Force *[BALTFAX]* 50
Other Attacks on Utilities Cited *[BALTFAX]* 51
Lithuania 'Peculiar' Preparations for Anniversary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jun]* 51
New Latvian Law Will Spark Confrontation *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 52
Baltic Council Session Begins in Jurmala *[TASS]* 53

RSFSR

Government Condemns OMON's Vilnius Provocation *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Tatarstan President Views Union Treaty Signing *[TASS]* 53
27 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported *[Moscow Russian TV]* 53
Presidential Inauguration Bill Passed *[TASS]* 54
President's Salary Approved *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Novosibirsk Assails Gorbachev, Polozkov *[TASS]* 55
'Fifth Wheel' Roundup of Yeltsin's U.S. Trip *[Moscow Russian TV]* 55
Yeltsin Backed by Defense Industry Workers *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 56
Silayev Claims Success in Anti-Crisis Debate *[Moscow International]* 57
Silayev Chairs 'Brainstorming Session' on Market *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 57
Silayev, FRG Delegation View Political Prospects *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 25 Jun]* 58
Bashkir Supreme Soviet Approves Union Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 59
Sobchak Comments on Leningrad Situation, Economy *[INTERFAX]* 59
Communist Party Politburo To Convene Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Jun]* 59
Russia in Direct Wheat Purchase Deal With Canada *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 60
RSFSR Bodies Appeal for Harvest Aid *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jun]* 60

Western Republics

More Economic Power for Belorussia Government *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Belorussian Party on Meaning of 'USSR' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Jun]* 61
Clash at Ukraine Supreme Soviet Reported *[INTERFAX]* 62
Ukraine Supreme Soviet Continues Debate *[INTERFAX]* 62

Caucacus

Azerbaijan's Mutalibov on Future of Union *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 63
Azerbaijan Approves Draft Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 65
'Independent Azerbaijan' Against Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 66
Newspaper Accuses Georgian Authorities of Bias *[INTERFAX]* 66

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Approves Denationalization Program *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 66
Kazakh Parliament Debates New Media Law *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 66
Kyrgyz President Assesses Union Treaty *[TASS]* 67
Kyrgyz Supreme Soviet Endorses Draft Treaty *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 67
Tajikistan Supreme Soviet Adopts Citizenship Law *[TASS]* 67

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Holds Press Briefing

Churkin News Briefing

LD2706172191 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 27 Jun 91

[by TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—The Soviet Union today hailed progress in the intra-Khmer dialogue and reaffirmed its readiness together with other states to pledge to halt arms supplies to Cambodia. This comment was made at a briefing today by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin.

Churkin also noted "with satisfaction" that some progress has been achieved at the talks between the Iraqi government and reprsentatives of Kurdish organisations on the expansion of autonomous rights of Iraqi Kurdistan, and "we since ely wish them to be a success."

Churkin said that in extreme meterorological conditions four AN-2 light soviet planes had to cross the Thai border and land at the closest airfield in Thailand. Churkin told the briefing today that the crossing of the border has not been deliberate.

The spokesman said that these planes are part of the consignment of the aircraft that the Soviet joint stock company Interavia is to supply the Lao side under an agreement signed with the Lao Ministry of Civil Aviation.

Replying to a question on the situation on Soviet-Mongolian border, Churkin said the closure of several border checkpoints "was not a conflict." Restrictions on entry into Mongolia from the Soviet Union, he said, are "temporary and are due to a shortage of border guards and customs officers from both sides in summer time when the seasonal load increases."

Speaking about the detention of five Soviet citizens in Hungary, Churkin reaffirmed that the Soviet citizens, namely two demobilised Soviet army soldiers, one civilian employee and two citizens who came to Hungary by invitation, were in the area of Tekel airport (Pest region). They were detained because papers on the car they were going to take out of the country were not properly issued, the diplomat said. The consulate of the Soviet Embassy in Hungary is giving legal assistance to these Soviet citizens. After the settlement of the incident they will return home.

Commenting on the statement by the Romanian parliament on the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, Churkin said the pact was made null and void by Germany's aggression against the Soviet Union and the current broders between the USSR and Romania were the result of the Second World War, the peace treaty between the two countries and were confirmed by common European documents.

Therefore, he emphasised, discussing the pact now has "a purely theoretical importance."

"Moldova continues to remain one of the union republics of the USSR and all issues that may arise will be solved by Moldova and central government in the course of signing of the union treaty," Churkin said.

Asked about the Foreign Ministry's attitude to Russia's plans to have direct contacts with the United States, Churkin said the fact "caused no concern". On the contrary, the potential of Soviet-U.S. relations is so huge that "the centre, republics and regions—all those interested in developing bilateral relations—will be busy" tapping it.

Progress in Khmer Talks Hailed

LD2706145191 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Report by TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—The Soviet Union today hailed progress in the intra-Khmer dialogue and reaffirmed its readiness together with other states to pledge to halt arms supplies to Cambodia. This comment was made at a briefing today by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin.

As is known, all Khmer sides have reached important agreements at a meeting of Cambodia's Supreme National Council regarding the indefinite cease-fire, the rejection of foreign military aid and organisation of practical work of the Supreme National Council.

"We welcome progress in the intra-Khmer dialogue and support constructive elements that have arisen in the national reconciliation process in Cambodia," Churkin said.

"Implementation of agreements would help take the talks to the final stage of the international Paris conference," Churkin continued. "In this connection it would be important to ensure the continuity of the negotiating process in Cambodia with all interested sides included."

"In view of the position of the Supreme National Council there emerged a real possibility to stop arms supplies from outside into Cambodia," Churkin said in conclusion. "The Soviet Union reaffirms its readiness, together with other states, to formally undertake the relevant obligations."

'Satisfaction' With Iraqi-Kurdish Talks

LD2706144191 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Report by TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—"We state with satisfaction that some progress has been achieved at the talks

between the Iraqi Government and representatives of Kurdish organisations on the expansion of autonomous rights of the Iraqi Kurdistan, and we sincerely wish them to be a success," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said at a briefing here today. He believes that the agreement on this issue will make it possible for Kurdish refugees to return home, which will remove tension in the northern regions of Iraq, and at the same time it will facilitate the settlement of the problem of ensuring security and stability in the region on the whole.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out that if agreement was reached on the expansion of autonomous rights of Iraqi Kurdistan, the problem of foreign military presence there would be viewed from another angle. "We have always proceeded from the assumption that the humanitarian operation for helping the Kurdish population" of Iraq should be fully transferred as soon as possible to the [words indistinct] corresponding U.N.institutions," Churkin added.

Landing of Aircraft in Thailand

LD2706153391 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said that in extreme meteorological conditions four AN-2 light Soviet planes had to cross the Thai border and land at the closest airfield in Thailand. Churkin told the briefing today that the crossing of" the border has not been deliberate.

The spokesman said that these planes are part of the consignment of the aircraft that the Soviet joint stock company Interavia is to supply the Lao side under an agreement signed with the Lao Ministry of Civil Aviation.

The planes are meant for charter flights.

AN-2 planes have a small range, so they were delivered by a cargo plane to Interavia base in Danang, Vietnam to be assembled and prepared for flight.

Churkin said that when the planes were flying from Vietnam to Laos, they had on board Soviet crews, a Lao navigator and Soviet specialists who will service the Soviet aviation equipment under a contract with Lao side.

Altogether 15 Soviet pilots and specialists flew to Laos by AN-2 planes. They have been accomodated in a hotel of the Thai city of Udon Thani and are feeling well.

Agreement With PRC Discussed

LD2706152591 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—Speaking at a briefing in Moscow today, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin dwelt on the Soviet-Chinese agreement, signed in Moscow on May 16, regarding the Soviet-Chinese state border in its Eastern section. The agreement has yet to be ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Speaking about the historical aspect of delimitation of the territory between the two states, Vitaliy Churkin said that Russian-Chinese treaties did not determine the ownership of islands on the Rivers Amur and Ussuri, and the rivers themselves were regarded as a border line. However in the years of occupation of Manchuria in 1931-45, Japanese troops began to move into the river islands forcing Soviet border troops to unilaterally take parts of river sections under their protection, including the Damanskiy Island, the site of well-known events in 1969.

As for further efforts to establish the ownership of the islands on the Rivers Amur and Ussuri, Churkin continued, the sides agreed way back in 1964 on a principle, whereby the border passed by the middle of the ship channel on navigable rivers and by the middle of the river or its main course on innavigable rivers. However the consultations on border issues that started in 1964 were not finalised.

At the Soviet-Chinese talks that resumed in 1987 the principle, generally accepted by the international law (the principle of the main ship channel), was used as a basis for specifying the passage of a border line on [words indistinct].

Churkin said no agreement has been reached on a small section in the area of Khabarovsk in the eastern part of the Soviet-Chinese border. He said the signing of the border agreement with no agreement reached on one of the sections testifies to the sides' great trust in one another.

Replying to a TASS question, Churkin said that representatives of the Russian Foreign Ministry took part in the final stage of work on this agreement. He also stressed that Russian authorities have made no remarks with regard to the final text of the document.

Moscow Mandarin on PRC Border

OW2806094191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 0200 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] At today's press briefing, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Churkin dwelt on the essence of the Soviet-Chinese Treaty on the Border in the Eastern Section, signed in Moscow on 16 May, saying that the border on

the Amur and Ussuri Rivers was settled according to the principle of the universally recognized international law of the modern times, whereby the border passed by the middle of the main course on navigable rivers.

No agreement has been reached on a small section in the Khabarovsk area.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said: The signing of the border treaty before an agreement is reached on a section of the border testifies to the tremendous trust between the two sides.

Foreign Ministry To Discuss Replacing CEMA

OW2806075091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Friday in Budapest the dismantling of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) will be announced officially. The same day, as IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent learned from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's department for international economic organizations, will see a conference on the issue of replacing CMEA.

This won't be a legal successor of CMEA, not an organization for international economic cooperation that had been planned. This will be a consultative body with elements of coordination, not an integrative one.

According to Foreign Ministry officials, the USSR will evidently agree that this will be a regional, European, organization. As for the other former members of CMEA: Mongolia, Vietnam and Cuba, relations with them will be maintained on bilateral basis and in the framework of 22 agreements on multilateral cooperation that are still in force. In the future the forms of their associated membership in the new organization might be found.

Ignatenko Briefing on Gorbachev, G-7 Meeting

PM2706135191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by G. Alimov: "Could an 'Eight' Come Out of the 'Seven?'"]

[Text] USSR President M. Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to London to meet with the "seven" is generating undiminishing interest among the mass media. Of course, this event goes far beyond the framework of ordinary international contacts. At a routine briefing by V. Ignatenko, the leader of the USSR president's press center, the majority of journalists' questions touched on precisely this subject.

On the program of the visit. It has still not been determined, nor has the membership of the delegation. It is merely known that M. Gorbachev will address the "seven" 17 July. Now, according to the USSR president's aide, intensive work is under way to prepare this meeting.

Whose program will the president choose? As is well known, the president has a number of independent program for the preparation of his report. There is the anticrisis program proposed by the prime minister, the "Harvard group" plant, and the report submitted in the past for the Soviet president's attention by the International Reconstruction and Development Bank. Nor can one fail to take account of what is being done by the group of scientists in the "Volynskiy" [reference unknown] near Moscow. V. Ignatenko said that this group has been joined by scientists of various schools—the well known economists Primakov, Martynov, Kokoshin, Medvedev, Yeremenko, Abalkin, Petrakov, Aganbegyan, Popov, and others. And what will the president choose? To judge by the reply from the president's official representative that is not how the question stands. M. Gorbachev will deliver his own report and say what he considers it necessary to say. "It will be his personal report, his personal statement," V. Ignatenko noted.

Does the USSR intend to apply for admission to the "Seven?" The main task of the trip, the briefing presenter said, is to achieve understanding for our reforms and to bring cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Western countries to a new stage. That does not mean that our president will knock on the doors of the "seven" and try to make it an "eight." But in the future Ignatenko does not rule this out. In his opinion the direction in which our relations are proceeding could ultimately lead to this goal. The Soviet president's present invitation can only be viewed as the first step in building up large-scale relations between our country and the "seven." V. Ignatenko recalled that such ties can of course only be established gradually. And depending on their quality within two-three years it may perhaps be possible to speak of some different status for the Soviet Union within the framework of the "seven" if not of the "eight."

What conditions have been set for the Soviet president? V. Ignatenko denied some opinions that the "seven" made the meeting in London conditional on a number of political demands. "No political conditions are being set for us," V. Ignatenko said. "The only condition discussed is that we be loyal to our own internal commitments as regards carrying out reforms."

That is why the president's report will be a frank, detailed description of the concept of the Soviet Union's economic development.

Role in Asia-Pacific Region Viewed

91UF0902A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by V. Golovnin: "Small Steps: Will They Help Our Pacific Policy?"]

[Text] The words had been skillfully crafted and were uttered with feeling, so to speak. Concluding his speech, the young and energetic American ambassador for Pacific affairs effected a well-calculated pause and enunciated clearly into the microphone: "The Soviets do not have a Pacific policy, they have only a Pacific Fleet."

This was in the times of the "late cold war," when Moscow and Washington were still trying by might and main to hit one another as painfully as possible and the few Soviet representatives attending the Conference on Pacific Economic Cooperation in Tokyo took great offense at these words. How could our initiatives be ignored in this way, they said, only a blind man could fail to see the USSR's efforts to strengthen peace in Asia. Nonetheless, they were heavy-hearted: The words of the arrogant American contained, alas, much that was true.

For decades Moscow had stubbornly discerned in all manifestations of economic integration in the Pacific, for example, merely insidious attempts "to cobble together a new NATO." The "positive aspect" of our regional program amounted to cheerless advocacy, which dragged on over the long Brezhnev-Chernenko years, of the formation of a "system of collective security in Asia." Initially, under the conditions of the strict confrontation of Moscow and Beijing, this was seen merely as a poorly disguised call for the creation of an anti-China front, but subsequently simply became a hollow ritual slogan, which no one wished to hear.

The most influential countries in the Asia-Pacific region treated us with outright malevolence, while the rest preferred, in the main, to keep as far away from the "Soviets" as possible, particularly against the background of Afghanistan, the destruction of the South Korean Boeing, and the active Soviet military assistance to "its people" in Indochina and Pyongyang. Vladivostok, which had at one time been created as a "window on the Pacific," was tightly boarded up against the outside world; the USSR's commercial and financial participation in the affairs of the region, which was stunning the world by its collective economic miracle, which, alas, had nothing to do with our part of the Pacific coastline, was negligible in volume and primitive in quality.

Much now is in the past, of course. We have left Afghanistan and have, in my opinion, convinced our neighbors that we will never again attempt to make them happy by force of arms. We have ended our futile enmity with vast China, which had driven us into a corner, forcing us to necessarily impart to all our steps in the Asia-Pacific region the nature of a "rebuff of the Beijing hegemonists." The swift maneuver involving the recognition of Seoul has not only afforded us an interested partner and reduced to nothing the threat of war on the Korean peninsula. It has shown the countries of the region that Moscow has firmly opted for intelligent pragmatism and no longer intends having its hands tied by dubious ideological considerations. Finally, the rapprochement with the United States is daily convincing the vast majority of states of the Asia-Pacific region, which have long been oriented toward the West, that it is now safe to do business with the Soviets.

All this has "pacified" our colossal border in Asia and created a durable neutral cycle for a positive Soviet policy in the Pacific, about the absence of which our opponents have spoken so caustically. But where to find the reference points of a firm strategy capable, if only in time, of introducing us to the club of rapidly prospering countries of the region, to which we belong as yet, alas, more in a geographical than economic and even political respect?

Unfortunately, Moscow is frequently and, in my opinion, rightly reproached for the fact that its Pacific policy is, on account of the preoccupation with relations with the West and domestic affairs, shaped in impromptu fashion, as it were. And the very concept of "strategy" is at times still understood with us in the good old spirit—as a set of the most resonant "initiatives" possible which are laid in store for this important occasion or the other, regardless of whether they have a chance of being implemented or not.

One of two recently proclaimed regional proposals of the USSR—a five-party meeting of representatives of the main Asian and Pacific countries, in Moscow's opinion: the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Japan and India, was, for example, given a cool reception in the Asia-Pacific region. But was the insipid reaction to this idea so unexpected?

Two participants out of the proposed "five"—Washington and Tokyo—consider themselves, with sufficient reason, the natural leaders of the Asia-Pacific region and have no intention of elevating Moscow, Beijing, or Delhi to their level. Nor, in addition, is anything currently, to put it mildly, compelling them to do so either. The very idea of a narrow conference to discuss problems of the entire giant region had an entirely inappropriate whiff of a great-power compact, which is manifestly unpopular in the world at this time. This imperial taint offended, for example, the rapidly developing countries of Southeast Asia, which undoubtedly perform a far bigger economic role in the Asia-Pacific region than the USSR and that same India. It was not fortuitous that even the Indian press, very sensitive to international acknowledgments of its country's importance, remained silent about the new Soviet initiative. And China did not, essentially, consider it even worth a comment.

Judge for yourselves: What specifics could be discussed at one negotiating table by such different countries as the United States, Japan, the USSR, the PRC, and India with reference to the Asia- Pacific region? The economy? But their weight categories and concerns are too varied. Arms reductions? If in Northeast Asia, what has India got to do with this? And if in South Asia, Japan's role would be incomprehensible.

Of course, the second Soviet regional initiative appears more attractive: the proposal concerning the staging in

1993 of a meeting of foreign ministers of all Asian and Pacific countries. This idea has been in the air a long time inasmuch as, in the opinion of many people, the dynamic region has matured to the point of a collective solution of a mass of questions—from the environment through security. Just one "small thing" is missing, as they say—the formulation of an algorithm of discussion of problems of the colossal region which do not stack together well and the absence of "sponsors" capable of preparing such a forum who are acceptable to all. The USSR, in any event, is manifestly not up to this role as yet. And we should not refer to the success of the CSCE, whose experience is not all that appropriate in the Asia-Pacific region: There a geographically compact region was clearly divided into two opposite camps and a small group of neutrals, which facilitated organizational matters. There was also in Europe a "main problem" common to all: how to avoid a suicidal East-West clash. And this automatically made the USSR a leading player on the field.

There is in the Asia-Pacific region no such "single theme," and the Korean problem there, for example, has little connection with the Cambodian problem. Even the members of the large pro-West market community in the Asia-Pacific region are largely playing for themselves, and the "socialist" countries in the shape, say, of the DPRK and Vietnam will now hardly agree to consider Moscow their leader and unconditionally support its initiatives, as was done quite recently even in Europe by the members of the Warsaw Pact.

The Asia-Pacific region is also known for the fact that it has since the time of the Vietnam war viewed with great suspicion proposals of the "great powers," which might be endeavoring to pull the countries of the region into their own dangerous games. It is not fortuitous that all the blocs of the SEATO-type created by the Americans in the Pacific zone have collapsed and that several fine ideas of integration have been buried only because they were advanced by potential "hegemonists"—Tokyo, say. And, on the contrary, there has been success merely for plans which have emanated (if only formally) from small states. The sole mechanism of effective regional consultations as of the present has been created so as to emphasize the priority of small and militarily nonpowerful countries: the foreign ministers of the ASEAN states (Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore and Brunei) first meet at an annual conference, and only then are they joined by their colleagues from "wealthy and powerful states"—the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the European Community—with guest status. All this, as you can understand, largely deprives the USSR of any hope of seizing the initiative in regional processes. The more so in that a number of private and intergovernmental organizations has long been involved in the unhurried preparation of integration in the Pacific, and the countries of the region have still to be convinced of the need for the creation of new mechanisms.

Let us not forget that the Asia-Pacific region is a zone of fantastically rapid development of industry and trade and the movement of capital and the latest technology. The USSR performs in these processes, as before, a role close to zero. Statistics show, on the other hand, that the main export market assuring the well- being of the Asia-Pacific region countries is the United States, and the source of capital and technology, that same United States plus Japan, which has become the basis of the strength of their positions in the region. To our misfortune Washington and Tokyo have quite a negative view of the USSR's penetration of the expanses of the Pacific. The United States because it struggled with the Soviets for the whole postwar period and altogether considers the Pacific "its own lake," where even potential competitors should be shot down. The Japanese have similar motives multiplied by an ardent desire to punish Moscow for its intractability on the problem of the "northern territories."

As far as the developing countries are concerned, some of them are afraid even of the more active involvement of the USSR in the region's affairs inasmuch as this could divert in its direction the flows of financial and technological assistance. Our participation in the integration processes as a country with a "nonmarket economy" is giving rise to doubts also. Finally, the Soviet Union is still associated with "communism," which in the majority of developing and "new industrial" countries of the Asia-Pacific region evokes an immediate rejection response. After all, this word is linked there not only with a philosophy which is unacceptable to them and unsuccessful economic practice but also with ruthless Marxist guerrillas who attempted by way of armed struggle to implant their ideas both in the jungles of Malaysia and on the islands of the Philippines.

But enough of listing the "minuses" which could complicate for the Soviet Union the path to the flourishing Pacific. It is already clear, I believe, that it will be difficult to look there for a delighted response to far-reaching Soviet initiatives, which it makes sense advancing essentially merely to ensure that our desire to participate in Asia-Pacific region affairs is not forgotten. But the situation is far from hopeless: The end of the "cold war" affords us, for all that, a serious opportunity to penetrate a region which is now increasingly less afraid of the "Pacific Fleet" and increasingly prepared to take account of the USSR at the time of the solution of its problems.

The start of the 1990's has coincided for the small- and medium-sized states of the Asia-Pacific region with a real danger of their conversion from favorites of the world economy to its outsiders. The "Uruguay Round" of global negotiations of market economy countries, which had attempted to amicably negotiate a liberalization of trade policy, a reduction in customs dues, and so forth, ended last December in failure. The failure was caused to a large extent by the hard line of the Europeans, who were unwilling to open up their market unduly to others on the threshold of 1993, when a "single

Europe" begins. On the other hand, the United States had already signed a free-trade agreement with Canada and is now conducting such negotiations with Mexico, which will formalize an economic bloc in North America. This will confront the disconnected Asia-Pacific region with the intimidating prospect of a constriction of sales markets and sources of credit. And whereas powerful Japan is still prepared to respond to the new challenge in isolation, the small countries of the region have begun to rush around in search of a solution.

It is with this, in my view, that the sensational decision of ASEAN members to invite to their regular consultations with the "great powers" representatives of the USSR and China, which just a year ago would have been a complete fantasy, is connected. The small states of the region clearly aspire to widen their field of maneuver and show the West that they do have a choice. Of course, this has a slight smack of political blackmail as yet, although I believe that the export-oriented Asia-Pacific region countries are seriously pondering transactions on the Soviet market also.

Japan, incidentally, immediately voiced its displeasure at Moscow's association with the regional dialogue based on ASEAN, but even its position is far from unequivocal these days. We would recall that in the course of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Japan, Tokyo assented to the USSR's participation in organizations preparing the ground for Pacific economic integration. In other words, it is not that Japan is categorically opposed to Moscow's involvement in the affairs of the Asia-Pacific region but is merely endeavoring to keep this process under its control, linking it, specifically, with the progress of negotiations on the "northern territories." Washington's attitude toward the USSR's actions in the Pacific, in which the United States discerns increasingly few military-political accents which frighten it, has become markedly more neutral also.

But so propitious a set of conditions may be taken advantage of in full if the essence of our regional policy are not only and not so much clamorous and at times startling initiatives pertaining to the creation of new "negotiating mechanisms" but a "small steps strategy" for the quiet, de-ideologized penetration of all the regional organizations and all regional programs opening up to us. It is in this direction that our diplomats and businessmen, who, for example, have almost secured the USSR's participation in the two main associations involved in Pacific economic cooperation, although previously we were not even allowed to come close, are now scoring the biggest successes.

Of course, the Soviet Union has little to offer its dynamic Asia-Pacific region neighbors as yet. But it is extremely important not to be late always and to even now be preparing the infrastructure for its participation in the single Pacific community of the next century, when Vladivostok will finally stand on the same footing as Singapore, Sydney, and Tokyo not only as the base of the excellent Pacific Fleet but also as a center of the new regional policy.

Soviet, International Terrorism Surveyed

91WR0247 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 91 pp 2-3

[Article by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent A. Ganelin: "Terrorism in the USSR: We Did Not Take Another Road"]

[Text] "The forward movement of history is terribly slow; history should be pushed..." A. Zhelyabov

...On occasion, it appears that we are now living as if in the year eighteen hundred dynamite-and-revolver. Here is someone tossing a package at a speeding coach. An explosion! Also, this event happens: A gentleman in uniform is approached on an avenue by two people, they draw revolvers, and fire point blank...

It appears that the smoke from Karakozov's gun is reaching into our year 1991, and the explosions of "devices from hell" in Petersburg reverberate at present not only in Riga. Words from the parlance of the People's Will-SR [Socialist Revolutionary Party] come to mind increasingly often—"dynamiters," "ex" [expropriation], "bomb throwers," "revolver men"—which have apparently long been relegated to the Museum of Revolution.

Previously, we divided history into that before the year 1917, and that after the year 1917. Now we divide history into that before 1985 and that after 1985. So, before 1985 there were almost no terrorist acts in the Union, and the ones that were committed were few and far between. Sometime during the 1970's, a man with explosives strapped to his body forced his way into the American Embassy in Moscow and demanded to be sent to the United States. Later, the former militiaman Ilin, who believed that he had been fired unfairly, took two handguns and went to kill Leonid Ilich. However, cosmonauts were riding in the first car to leave the Kremlin. Ilin fired on it. Everybody remembers the 1977 explosion on the subway in Moscow. There were fatalities. However, the KGB promptly found terrorists. At the time, there were, in general, but a few cases of explosions, and all of them were solved. For example, a plant employee in Norilsk wanted to take vengeance against the director, and tossed a grenade into a trash can. However, what kind of terrorism was this? All this did was to give the endeavor a bad name.

It is really different now!

In the last two years, there have been 37 acts of air terrorism; in 10 cases, the skyjackings of planes abroad have succeeded. In 1990 and 1991, about 200 explosions have occurred, 50 people have died, and 130 have been wounded. By 1 January 1990, 15 deputies at all levels

were killed. In 1987, USSR President M. Gorbachev received 132 threats, and last year as many as 261.

In all of that, employees of the KGB Administration for Combating Terrorism say that it is easier to apprehend single-handedly a group of armed terrorists than to prove that they are terrorists.

From the Files of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA

Under the Criminal Code, the following are considered terrorist acts in the Soviet Union: murder of a state or public figure, or a representative of the authorities, committed in conjunction with his state or public activities, with a view to undermining or weakening Soviet power.

It used to be quite clear and easy to understand who a state or public figure was, and who a representative of the authorities was. What about now? For example, recently Roman Kalinin, a leader of the Libertarian Party and chairman of the Association of Sexual Minorities, was beaten up by persons unknown. His beating hardly undermined what we mean by Soviet power. On the other hand, Kalinin was a candidate for the president of Russia, albeit an unsuccessful one. You sort this one out: Are those who beat him up terrorists, or merely outraged representatives of the sexual majority? Seriously speaking:

Vladimir Andreyevich Mironov, deputy chief of the KGB Administration for Combating Terrorism, said: "We expect a wave of terrorist acts, and we prepare for this. A formidable law on fighting terrorists should be adopted."

It could be that they scare us for no good reason. At first, they scared us with a crime wave, then with economic sabotage, and now with a wave of terrorism. When they talk about stepping up the fight against terrorism, we cannot help recalling Stalinist trials of "terrorists." We are more afraid of fighting terrorism than of the terrorists themselves. Who is going to fight them? After all, the KGB is "a hireling of the CPSU," "a terrorist organization!" Generally, you can hear this at any rally. What about the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs]? And the MGB [Ministry of State Security]? On whose instructions was Trotskiy murdered? And not just him...

One of the "committee men" said: "Do you know what the Americans call the USSR? A country of historians, a society which continuously looks to the future with its back forward. We continuously take an interest in the past rather than looking at what is going on around us at present and deciding how to combat it. Meanwhile, the bombs explode now."

Well, if we turn around to face the future let us try to predict whether the bombs will stop exploding tomorrow.

...A civil war will not start in the immediate future. A stage of massive terror usually occurs before a civil war. In constructing a classical pattern of the development of terrorism, specialists divide it into several stages. Everything begins with moral terror: threats over the phone and in leaflets and inscriptions on the walls calling for reprisals. Subsequently, murders and overt criminal acts, for example, raids on banks in order to meet the financial needs of various organizations, are committed in order to prove that these are not meaningless threats. The last stage includes explosions on the subway, in the airports, and other crowded locations. The ultimate goal is to unleash a civil war...

At what stage is our country at present?

...The people have begun to engage in the kind of politics in which terror increasingly becomes a means of political struggle, forgetting the lessons of our own history: So far, nobody has succeeded in changing the course of history and achieving his political goals through terrorism, no matter how good the goals, in the name of which it has been used, were. We should not look to the future with our backs, but it is dangerous to turn our back on the past.

On 4 April 1886, Karakozov fired at Aleksandr II. The tsar was safe and sound. The failure of Karakozov provided "luxurious food" for talk about the fact that he was a noble, whereas the person who held back the hand of the regicide was a peasant. They trumpeted everywhere: The landowners want to kill the tsar in order to avenge the emancipation of the peasants. Terror began in response to the noise of popular indignation.

The terror of the left invariably provided grounds for the terror of the right. The People's Will came along due to disenchantment after reaching out to the people. The People's Will switched to terror precisely when it understood that it is impossible to start a popular uprising. They wanted so much to topple autocracy as soon as possible and to make the people happy. Zhelyabov said: "The forward movement of history is terribly slow; history should be pushed..." They pushed it from behind by using dynamite and revolvers.

...I, for one, am a person who is hopelessly spoiled by socialism. To me, and I think not only to me, the men of People's Will and the SR were revolutionaries and heroes. They fought, with bombs and revolvers, for the happiness of the people, sacrificing their lives. However, I have now started thinking about the 32 people who were killed and the 30 who were wounded in an attempt on Stolypin's life in 1906. Are they not the people? What about them? Are they merely victims of giving a push to history?

Compare the chronicles of those years and today's chronicles. They attacked police precincts then, and they attack militia precincts now. Last year, there were about 100 attacks on MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] organs. However, at present I do not consider those who bomb and shoot to be heroes. They consider themselves revolutionaries.

After all, we may also say that we are having a revolution now. In 1906, revolutionaries killed General Kozlov in Petergof by mistake, instead of Trepov. In 1991, Colonel Blakhotin was killed by mistake in Rostov-on-Don instead of General Safronov, who is the commandant of the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] special region. When will we understand that a murder, even in the name of a great objective, is nonetheless a murder?

The people of my generation had posters of Che Guevarra on their walls. To us, he was a revolutionary hero. For many people in South America, he was a terrorist who fought the legitimate government. Everything was likewise clear with Palestinian patriots—they were fighting for the freedom of their people. It also appeared to be clear and simple with other fighters against imperialism. However, what about the 270 passengers of the Pan Am plane which was blown up in the air? Or what about the passengers of the Greek tourist vessel City of Poros against which terrorists mounted a raid, killing nine people and wounding 78 (one of those killed was a small child)? Or what about the hundreds of people who are killed or wounded in the course of this "struggle," and the hostages taken?

We were taught that the men of the People's Will were heroes, to be sure, but they did not opt for the right road. The method of individual terror is not right. Plus, there was the historic phrase "We will take another road."

We did not take another road.

...On 30 August 1918, Kaplan shot the author of this historic phrase. To be sure, at present historians are questioning the fact that Kaplan was precisely the one to make this attempt. However, this provided a pretext, and Bolsheviks responded to "White terror" with "Red terror." When a state sponsors terror, loners with self-made little bombs appear to be playful children with New Year's firecrackers. "White terror," "Red terror," what difference does its color make? At present, it is not fashionable to quote the classics of Marxism-Leninism, but I will take the liberty of recalling Engels: "Terror is useless cruelty perpetrated by people who are in fear themselves."

We will take another road. However, for a very long time, we and our allies in the socialist camp were accused of never leaving this road, precisely by supporting terrorism.

After the disintegration of "the socialist camp," quite interesting reports appeared in Western newspapers.

Letters and documents published by the new minister of internal affairs of Hungary testify that the international terrorist known under the assumed name of Carlos was given asylum in Hungary in 1979. This is the latest in a string of denunciations which confirm that East European countries provided sanctuary for suspects wanted for committing terrorist acts in the West. Nine fugitives were arrested in East Germany who were sought for a long time in conjunction with bomb explosions organized by the West German leftist terrorist group RAF. Attacks on cars, hijackings, murders, and explosions—everything was done under the flag of "fighting imperialism." After the revolution in Romania, information appeared about camps training Middle Eastern terrorists which were controlled by the Romanian secret police Securitate. Soon after Havel became president of Czechoslovakia, it was reported that the previous government had sold to Libya 1,000 tons of Semtex explosive which was used to manufacture bombs.

The USSR was accused on many occasions of being associated with the Red Brigades and the RAF, helping the Palestinian terrorists, and taking part in an attempted assassination of the pope through Bulgaria. Did the KGB, which is now combating terrorism, take part in training international terrorists? Asking the KGB about it is like asking a respectable matron whether she used to perform in a variety show because she resembles the portrait on an old poster? Having done the tactless thing, I heard once again: "We never had association, we did not help, we did not take part." All I managed to find out was that several years ago, a Palestinian woman who was involved with an organization responsible for blowing up a plane visited our country. However, as they explained to me, nobody trained her in the USSR; it is just that her stay in our country was monitored all the time, and she was sent away from our country at the first opportunity.

Of course, we may assume that the former GDR would have hardly sheltered the RAF members with the help of the former Ministry of State Security without "the elder brother" knowing; however, this is mere conjecture. At any rate, a struggle between two systems was underway; we, and not we alone, were not political vegetarians, and this is why we provided assistance to "the fighters of the national- liberation movement," and Western special services provided assistance to those who fought these fighters. At any rate, President Bush noted that the Soviet Union no longer encourages terrorism.

From the Files of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA

In 1989, an abrupt drop in the number of terrorist acts was registered in the world. The number of victims of such attacks also declined perceptibly. A total of 528 terrorist acts were committed in 1989; terrorism claimed 390 dead and 397 wounded as its victims.

In 1989, international terrorists stepped up actions against the USSR. Rockets were fired at the Soviet Embassy in Beirut; a South African nationalist was sentenced to imprisonment for an attempt to seize a Soviet cargo plane after it took off from the Luanda airport.

"Global Terrorism in 1989." Report by the U.S. State Department

For decades, we supported regimes which fought imperialism. A change in our current foreign policy may cause a wave of terrorism against us.

The United States and its allies were apprehensive about terrorist strikes during the recent war with Saddam. However, Iraq did not strike massive blows. Experts offer different explanations for this. However, the fact that the USSR did not support Saddam in his struggle undoubtedly played a role. So far, the USSR has not been bothered. However, our experts on fighting terrorism said that the Arabs are hinting: For now, we do not equate you with the United States. For now.... As we are now finding out, a good many international terrorists settled in Eastern Europe. It is not ruled out that there are international terrorists legalized under the cover of students and businessmen in our country as well. We may become a target for international terrorism as "traitors to the interests of the struggle against imperialism." To be sure, the KGB has lists of international terrorists, and it endeavors not to let them enter the USSR. However, the Law on Exit and Entry which will take effect in 1993 will bring about more entries to and exits from the country. Nobody is saying that crowds of terrorists will flock to the country. However, the possibility cannot be ruled out that international terrorist organizations—ultra-left, ultra-right, nationalist, and religious—will seek contacts with those inside the country of the same mind, ideologically. Ours will look for contacts with them for joint international actions.

The inscription on the flag of Cobra, the Austrian special unit for fighting terrorism, says "Terrorism Has No Chance."

What are our chances? So many flags of feuding political parties and religious and national organizations have been raised by now that a flag of terrorism may very well be raised too. What is necessary to this end? First of all, weapons. There is no dearth of them in the country. They manufacture weapons themselves, steal them from military depots, disarm sentries, and import weapons from abroad. According to KGB data, more than 5,500 rifled weapons are in the hands of extremists. Recently, two brothers were sentenced who manufactured remote-controlled explosive devices and sold them. Professionals say that these explosive devices do not have analogs.

The upshot: There are weapons in the country. There also are people who are prepared to use them. Every "hot spot" of interethnic conflict is a potential base for terrorism. Actions by foreign terrorist groups are also possible in the course of the "Lebanonization" of the USSR. After all, the leftist extremist group Japanese Red Army is now based in Lebanon. Are there no people in the Union who wish to create their own "Red Armies" in order to struggle against drawing countries into the orbit of "American imperialism?"

...By now, the expression "Armenian terrorism" has become common in our usage. Terrorism has sort of acquired its own "Point 5." This looks very much like the notion "the Uzbek affair." Words from an Armenian newspaper to the effect that Armenian land has given birth to Teyliryan as well, are eagerly quoted; it is said that death sentences have been given to Polyanichko and Safronov.

The Armenian student Teyliryan devoted his life to the search for Talaat-Pasha, who fled Constantinople after the rout of Turkey in 1918. When he found Talaat-Pasha in Germany five years later and killed him, the court acquitted Teyliryan. It sufficed for the court to learn the facts about the genocide of the Armenian populace.

The romanticism of "an avenger for his people," who risks his life, may attract young people not only in Armenia. It is frightening if someone bets again on individual terror. This will provide an opportunity to respond by massive repressions and a crack down.

Usually, terror is classified into the right and the left. The first is against the democratic, communist, and trade-union movement. Pseudorevolutionary phraseology is characteristic of leftist terrorism; it has a romantic aura, and finds support in the community of radical students, the intelligentsia, and petty bourgeoisie. At present, the notions of "right" and "left" in our country are somewhat different. However, our domestic ultrarightists, who want to stop the progress of history and turn everything back, may also be interested in terror. It is not ruled out that terrorist acts will be directed against Western businessmen, against those who "sell the country out." They may also be used by the ultraleft, to whom it appears that "history needs to be pushed." All of them together will push the country in unison toward a dictatorship.

However, terrorists are not necessarily members of some party or organization. Selivanov, who hijacked a plane to Helsinki, was found to be mentally ill by the court. Vorontsov, who killed the editor of the newspaper ZNAMYA, said himself that his parents had died in a psychiatric hospital. The man who fired during last year's 7 November demonstration in Red Square is mentally ill. Let us note the following regularity: Explosions and terrorist acts peak during a certain season of the year and in certain weather, during which the condition of mentally ill people is aggravated. We, the healthy ones, have "gone off the deep end" because of rallies and politics. Imagine how keenly this is perceived by people with a mental disorder.

In the West, they keep calculating what may happen in the Union. Could the most dangerous kind, nuclear terrorism, appear in the USSR? Over there, they understand that this is a threat not only to us, but also to them. Since there are cases of the theft of conventional weapons, nuclear weapons could be stolen as well, could they not? One American newspaper said that even in the event of the disintegration of the USSR, terrorists will hardly succeed in gaining control of nuclear weapons because all nuclear warheads have electronic codes, the key to which is held by the supreme command. Another newspaper said that nuclear terrorism may very well develop amid the ruins of the Soviet collapse; some

traitor-commander, or a representative of central authorities, may be tempted to use nuclear weapons for blackmail.

These are two mutually exclusive views. As far as a traitor-commander or a representative of central authorities using nuclear blackmail is concerned, this is rather a plot for a science-fiction movie. May simple terrorist groups seize nuclear weapons? The military answered unambiguously: No. Even if we assume this fantastic possibility, the terrorists will not be able to use the nuclear weapons.

However, is there the danger that nuclear power stations will become targets for terrorist attacks?

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Shtangiyev, deputy chief of the Main Security Administration of the Ministry of Nuclear Energy and Industry, said: "There have been cases when threats were communicated to our nuclear stations: 'We will attack, we will blow them up.' Please understand that this is virtually impossible to do. Paramilitary groups have approached stations. However, they will only be able to set off a nuclear explosion at a station if they bring in a nuclear device, and if the guards and troops do nothing. Even if they shell a nuclear station from grenade launchers and siege guns, they will not harm it. In general, note this for those to whom this insane idea might occur: The guards of the stations shoot to kill. Terrorists will be killed instantly."

Here is the latest event of last week: On 13 June, an attempt was made to hijack a passenger plane on the Rostov-Moscow route. The motive? The hijacker explained: To protest the presence of MVD troops in South Ossetia.

We will take another road?

United States & Canada

Report on Pirating of U.S. Films

91UF0908B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by G. Melekhov: "Time To Stop, Americans Told Our Video Pirates"]

Text]**The largest U.S. movie companies—Paramount, Columbia Pictures, Walt Disney, 20th Century Fox, and some others—have refused to participate in the Moscow International Film Festival, which starts on 8 July; they have also decided to stop selling their films to the USSR.**

In his announcement of this development, President of the American Motion Pictures Association Jack Valenti emphasized that the reason for this decision was open piracy of movies and video materials in the USSR.

This is unpleasant and shameful. We ourselves have been saying and writing for quite a while about the irresponsibility of some television stations and video cooperatives that flaunt accepted norms of the world movie business. Predatory activities around the silver screen is another shame we have to bear.

Everybody who possesses elementary decency and professional honesty condemns video piracy. At a Sovexportfilm [All-Union Association for the Export of Soviet Films of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee on Cinematography] press conference on 14 June its general director, O. Rudnev, handed out an official statement on this subject. Among other things it mentions considerable concern and alarm in regard to the situation in the video-leasing business on USSR territory. Thousands of programs—never purchased and not protected by licenses, predominantly American ones—are moving around cities and villages, bringing "shadow economy" dealers enormous profits.

The piracy is growing, encompassing broadcast and cable television. In the past television did not dare to show unlicensed movies; today it is right there with the others. For instance, during the last few months Moscow television broadcast a number of movies of American and European origin without acquiring the rights to show them. This basically illegal practice is being justified by ostensibly mitigating circumstances: The films are allegedly shown as "excerpts," in "fragmentary fashion." In reality the films are shown almost in their entirety, with only the beginning and the end cut off. International legal norms do not allow showing a film in any form without advance permission of the copyright holders. In addition to Moscow television, many republic, oblast, and regional television stations are also engaging in piracy. Video piracy is especially widespread on cable networks, the number of which lately have been growing at a fast rate.

The all-Union association Sovexportfilm, said O. Rudnev, decisively protests movie and video piracy in the USSR. This is dangerous both for the economy and for the moral atmosphere in the country. Showing pirated foreign films does tremendous damage to those organizations that acquire films for showing in the USSR legally, and observe all the attendant international norms. This situation can seriously complicate our relations with foreign organizations and companies that both produce and release films.

While we share the concern and indignation of our partners across the ocean, we nevertheless believe that the refusal of American cinematographists to participate in the film festival will hardly contribute to a constructive solution of the piracy problem.

To become a member of the civilized world community one has to observe commonly accepted norms. It is necessary to adopt, at state level, appropriate laws on copyrights and property rights in the area of audio and video communications, join the Bern Convention, and introduce harsh criminal law and administrative and economic sanctions against all types of video and movie piracy in the USSR

"It is necessary to understand," said O. Rudnev in conclusion, "that delaying the passage of legislation in regard to films takes billions of rubles out of the state treasury; it increases the chance of culture going wild in society, and creates a danger of undermining our relations with the world cinematography community."

Matlock Cited on Ties to Republics

91UF0908A Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 8 Jun 91 p 10

[Interview with Jack F. Matlock, Jr., U.S. ambassador to the USSR, by Valeriy Kadzhaya; place and date not given: "Blessed Are the Peacemakers"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Western diplomacy today has a completely new approach to the Union republics. This is the area in which Mr. Matlock is most active. I remember the briefing he conducted soon after the Persian Gulf War began and the military putsch in Lithuania which accidentally (?) coincided with this event: Matlock was asked whether his meeting with Yeltsin—which took place during the same time period—was the beginning of a new course for the American Administration.

"I have visited all the USSR republics," answered Matlock. "I met with the leadership of all of them. My latest meeting with Yeltsin is already the sixth one..."

Even before this briefing I asked Mr. Matlock during an interview about the American Administration's plans in regard to developing diplomatic relations with the republics.

"We will open our consulate in Kiev soon," said the ambassador. "I would also like to open consulates in other cities, including Tbilisi. We are negotiating with

Washington. If they approve, we will start negotiations with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and of those republics where we intend to have our representations."

[Kadzhaya] What is the attitude of the American public, and you personally, to the events taking place in Georgia now?

[Matlock] I am not sure that the American public understands well what Georgia is in general, let alone what is happening there. I am not completely informed, either, because we do not have a representation there. Of course, I read in the press about the events in Georgia, but I would rather not make any statements on the basis of this indirect information.[end Matlock]

Mr. Matlock never avoids answering journalists' questions, even very hard ones, but at the same time his answers are always highly weighed and carefully worded. Well, this is understandable—he is an ambassador, not a private individual. It is clear, however, even from his weighed and carefully worded answers that the American side is interested in developing direct ties with the republics. Opening a consulate, however, is a laborious matter that involves overcoming a huge number of bureaucratic obstacles; people's diplomacy has incomparably greater potential for establishing direct contacts. This purpose can be best served by a cultural center. Several years ago I already wrote that such centers could be opened in Tbilisi and Atlanta; at that time, however, although nobody rejected this idea in principle and it was even publicly supported, nobody did a thing in the direction of making it become a reality. Those were different times, however.[passage omitted]

Yeltsin Visit to AFL-CIO Reported

91UF0907A Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Jun 91 p 3

[Report by A. Fedorov: "Meetings in Washington Concluded"]

[Text] As already reported, in the course of his visit to the United States B.N. Yeltsin visited the headquarters of the AFL-CIO labor association. We placed a call to Washington, to the AFL-CIO Information Office, and asked its director, Rex Haresby, to describe B.N. Yeltsin's meeting with the leadership of America's unions. In response he offered to read out a news report published in the issue of the weekly AFL-CIO NEWS which has just appeared. This, in particular, is what it says.

Boris Yeltsin, the first democratically elected president of Russia, is warmly welcomed by the AFL-CIO, which highly appreciates his assistance to the free trade unions. AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland introduced Yeltsin to the members of the Executive Council, emphasizing that he had won a convincing victory at the recent elections for president of Russia.

Yeltsin demonstrated his ability to appeal to the people when he turned aside from the television cameras trained on him and addressed the AFL-CIO officials assembled in the hall and on the balcony directly so that the cameramen had to scramble to find a new spot for their cameras.

Kirkland, the report goes on to say, had invited B.N. Yeltsin to visit AFL-CIO headquarters when he had met him in May in Moscow, where many leaders of the newly emergent Soviet unions told Kirkland of Yeltsin's devotion to the cause of fundamental economic and democratic reforms. "The talks with the just-elected president of Russia," Kirkland said, "gave me an impression of his profound concern for the position of the poor, the unemployed, the elderly, and the sick. I also perceived his interest in interaction with democratic institutions, including free labor unions, for the accomplishment of the task of the restructuring of society...."

The report emphasizes that B.N. Yeltsin personally conducted a dialogue with striking miners and that he considers the strike an extreme measure, but man's legitimate right.

B.N. Yeltsin told those assembled about socioeconomic legislative instruments of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, in the sphere of wages, pensions, grants, and so forth included.

Northeast Asia

Soviet-Japanese Peace Negotiations Start in Tokyo

Rogachev Arrives, Meets Foreign Minister

LD2706162191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1427 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] [no dateline as received] On June 27 routine consultations between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan at the deputy minister level and a session of the permanent working group of the peace treaty between the USSR and Japan were held in Tokyo. The Soviet delegation was headed by I.A. Rogachev and the Japanese one by H. Owada.

The USSR representative was received by Y. Nakayama, minister of foreign affairs of Japan. The minister welcomed the forthcoming meeting of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev with the leaders of the "Seven" in London and stated that Japan is prepared to take a constructive part in discussing the report that the Soviet leader is to make.

In the course of the consultations ways were discussed for the sides to further cooperate on the development of Soviet-Japanese relations in the vein of the accords reached during the recent visit to Japan by the USSR president. In this document the progress being made in implementing a number of bilateral agreements and documents signed with respect to the results of the

Soviet-Japanese summit talks was examined in detail. The sides exchanged opinions on some topical international problems.

At the working group session, the sides continued the discussion of issues on preparing a peace treaty between the countries. The point of reference for the participants in the group was the provisions of the joint Soviet-Japanese statement of 19 April, 1991, on the need to speed up the work on completing the preparation of this document while simultaneously developing constructive cooperation in the practical spheres of bilateral relations, in an atmosphere of trust, goodneighborliness and mutual advantage.

Taking part in the talks were L.A. Chizhov, USSR ambassador to Japan, and G.F. Kunadze, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

On June 27 I.A. Rogachev met with Qian Qichen, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the PRC, who is in Japan on an official visit.

In the course of the friendly conversation an exchange of opinions took place on a number of problems of the Asian-Pacific region. The sides noted some of the positive changes which have recently revealed themselves in the situation on the Korean peninsula, in the process of a Cambodian settlement and in relations between the USSR and the PRC with the member countries of ASEAN.

Peace Treaty, Cambodia on Agenda

OW2806074191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] According to a TASS dispatch from Tokyo, the Soviet-Japanese vice ministerial talks and the meeting of the working group on the peace treaty have started in Tokyo. The Soviet side is represented in these meetings by Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev and the Japanese side by Deputy Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs Owada. The two sides will discuss the process of formulating the Soviet-Japanese peace treaty, including the issue of territorial delineation, and prospects of bilateral relations, as well as the issue of visits by Japanese citizens to the four Southern Kuriles Islands without visas. The visit of Japanese to the Southern Kuriles was suggested by the Soviet side during President Gorbachev's visit to Japan last April and has been embodied in the Soviet-Japanese joint communique.

The meetings will also take up the situation on the Korean peninsula, the peaceful settlement of the Cambodia problem, Soviet- U.S. relations, and a series of other international issues.

Commentary on Negotiations

OW2806094591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Commentary by station commentator Kondratyev]

[Text] Vice-ministerial talks and the meeting of the working group preparing the Soviet-Japanese peace treaty started in Tokyo today, 27 June. It seems that agreements reached during President Gorbachev's visit to Japan in April are beginning to be implemented. We will now broadcast Radio Moscow commentator, Kondratyev's comments on this issue:

I feel that there is a need to recall the fact that the special Soviet-Japanese working group discussed how to work for the signing of the Soviet-Japanese peace treaty before the Soviet president's visit to Japan. After several meetings, the working group concluded that in principle, it is possible to sign a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty. Looking back at the achievements of the summit talks in Japan, President Gorbachev stressed that during the process of discussions, we refrained from setting preconditions and putting forth ultimatum-type demands in Soviet-Japanese relations. We have thus been able to reach agreement on formulas which could become the key to opening up prospects for promoting friendly relations between the two countries.

I cited the above to show that a favorable basis has been established for the vice-ministerial talks and the meeting of the working group on the peace treaty. This favorable basis has been embodied in the Soviet-Japanese joint communique issued during President Gorbachev's visit to Japan last April. I believe that the fact that the communique provided for the way to resolve the territorial issue, the most difficult problem in Soviet-Japanese relations, is significant. The northern territories issue has to be resolved within the framework of the peace treaty. It is believed that the meetings in Tokyo and the work toward the signing of the peace treaty in the future, will be conducted according to the formulas which could become the key to better Soviet-Japanese relations mentioned by President Gorbachev. The Japanese Government seems to intend to resolve the difficult issues between the Soviet Union and Japan through a method better than the consultations carried out so far, and develop relations with the Soviet Government in the spirit of the Soviet-Japanese joint communique. Evidence of this is the fact that recently, Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu has stated that Japan and the other advanced nations support the Soviet perestroyka line. We hope that the regular Soviet-Japanese talks and the meetings of the working group on the peace treaty in Tokyo will bring about new developments.

Japan To Restrict Travel to Kuriles

PM2706105591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Japanese Foreign Ministry's Position"]

[Text] Tokyo—The Japanese Foreign Ministry intends to "tightly restrict" the number of Japanese who will be able to take advantage of the right to visit the southern Kurils without visas. MAINICHI reported today that this stance has been approved by the country's foreign policy department ahead of the next Soviet-Japanese consultations at deputy foreign minister level, due to open in Tokyo 27 June, and also the sitting of the working group formulating a peace treaty.

Only former residents of these islands and mass media representatives will be able to enjoy the right to freely visit the islands to which Japan lays claim. The Soviet side proposed establishing a visa-free system during USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit here in April.

According to MAINICHI, the Japanese Foreign Ministry's stance is attributable to fears that total acceptance of the Soviet initiative would "undermine the movement for the return of the northern territories." The Japanese Government subscribes to the viewpoint that all the southern Kurils should be transferred to full Japanese sovereignty simultaneously.

Reorganization of U.S. Unit at Misawa Noted

PM2706102791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[V. Vladimirov "Pertinent Comments": "Misawa's New Role"]

[Text] According to Japan's ASAHI SHIMBUN, the U.S. command is reorganizing the air formation stationed at the Misawa military base in the northern part of Honshu Island.

I would remind you that the U.S. Air Force has stationed 50 F-16 fighter bombers at this airbase. At one time these aircraft were converted for launching cruise missiles, including nuclear-tipped missiles. They have a radius of roughly 1,000 km and can reach areas of the Soviet Far East. That is why the United States chose Misawa as the location for its nuclear delivery vehicles.

Now a word about some details that ASAHI SHIMBUN reported. According to its data, the renaming of the U.S. air formation was an outward sign of the changes taking place at the Misawa Airbase. The word "tactical" has been dropped from the title, which means that its field of operations has expanded considerably. What is more, this March 13 F-16 fighter bombers were transferred from Misawa to Singapore, where they took part in the Singapore-U.S. "Kop Vest-91" [name as transliterated] air exercises. At ASAHI SHIMBUN's request, representatives of the U.S. military command confirmed this fact—the first instance of a U.S. troop subunit being transferred from Japan to a country in Southeast Asia.

There are reports that with this reorganization the Pentagon has begun implementing a plan aimed at forming a "mixed air formation" that would include fighter bombers from the Misawa Airbase. In other words, the Pentagon would have at its disposal a kind of "emergency [pozharnoye] air formation" of nuclear-capable aircraft.

Once the reorganization of the Misawa air formation is completed once and for all the Pentagon intends to transform this airbase into a kind of U.S. Air Force "forward-basing center" in the Asia-Pacific region from which U.S. combat aircraft will be rapidly dispatched to possible regional conflict zones. In the opinion of U.S. strategists, the recent Gulf crisis confirmed the need for the Pentagon to possess this kind of "center."

So Washington has drawn a typical conclusion from events that have taken place. It still prefers to protect its own interests by increasing and further stepping up combat might rather than by reducing tension.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Observer Assesses Outcome of Phatthaya Meeting

BK2806091191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1100 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Before the inter-Cambodian meeting in Phatthaya from 24 to 26 June, the mass media machine in Southeast Asian countries did not think much about the chance for success in this meeting. This kind of assessment is not surprising because the participants in a similar meeting three weeks ago in Jakarta, generally speaking, could not even start to discuss seriously a solution to the Cambodian problem. The talks were then blocked by the Khmer Rouge. Furthermore, the Khmer Rouge, by violating the cease-fire agreement, have resumed operations against Phnom Penh. This is why after the meeting in Jakarta, many observers thought that the war in Cambodia would never end.

However, a few hours after the meeting in Phatthaya had started, people clearly realized that the pessimistic prediction was wrong. So what has happened? First of all, in the view of our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, at the meeting in Phatthaya, agreement was reached on an unlimited cease-fire. Should this be called important? Personally, contrary to some papers in the region, I would not want to declare 24 June as the end of the bloody war in Cambodia, continues our observer.

As experience has shown, a characteristic feature of the Cambodian situation is its unpredictability. On the last day of the meeting, the Khmer Rouge again raised an issue which surprised people. This group rejected the idea which has already been supported by Phnom Penh and the Sihanouk and Son Sann groups on the participation of UN observers in supervising the cease-fire. What is curious is that earlier, the Khmer Rouge usually boast that they are most in favor of active UN participation in solving the Cambodian problem. Be that as it may, we still hope that the issue of UN control of the cease-fire in Cambodia would be positively solved.

Participants taking part in the Phatthaya meeting agreed to discuss this issue again at their next meeting in August. It ought to be recalled that only recently it has been interpreted that Phnom Penh has rejected active UN participation in a solution. However, the meeting in Phatthaya has shown that the truth is quite different. At this meeting, Comrade Hun Sen, head of the Phnom Penh government, was in favor of a large number of UN troops in Cambodia to oversee the cease-fire.

In my view, a major result of the Phatthaya meeting was the increased prestige of the Phnom Penh government. It is sufficient to say that participants to this meeting agreed to hold the next Supreme National Council meeting in Phnom Penh. This has been considered by many observers as unprecedented. It is difficult to properly assess the fact that all the three groups on the Cambodian opposition side have agreed to Phnom Penh's proposal to stop receiving foreign military aid by any means. It ought to be said that Indonesia and France, as cochairmen of the Paris International Conference on Cambodia, did not attend the meeting in Phatthaya. [sentence as heard] Also not attending the Phatthaya meeting were representatives of other countries involved in the Cambodian conflict. What does this mean?

Apparently it shows that, first of all, the process toward normalizing the situation in Cambodia has moved forward satisfactorily. This is why the Cambodian parties themselves think that they no longer need close tutelage from outside. This was the conclusion of our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev.

Authorities Fail To Clarify Source of AN-2's

PM2706142391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 p 4

[Report by S. Bartnikas: "Nobody's Soviet Airplane Dropped in at the Wrong Address"]

[Text] As reported on Radio Liberty, four Soviet Air Force aircraft made a forced landing in Thailand 22 June. According to a statement by Thai officials, they were being sent from South Vietnam to the Lao capital of Vientiane, where they were going to be handed over to the Lao Government. The aircraft will not leave Thailand until an investigation has been carried out into why they landed.

The Foreign Ministry told us that four AN-2's had indeed not completed their flight of about 180 km to Vientiane owing to adverse weather conditions and had landed at the Thai city of Udon Thani, close to the Lao border.

An informed Foreign Ministry staffer noted that at the moment the weather over Thailand can be treacherous: There are frequent tropical downpours and storms. Therefore there can be hardly any doubt about why the aircraft landed. At the same time the official investigation into the landing which has been started by the Thai authorities seems necessary: The aircraft did not have permission to land and everything must be clarified down to the last detail.

The Soviet side is hoping that the problem will soon be resolved and the An aircraft will be able to get to where they were originally headed. A Thai Embassy staffer, however, when he learned what we were calling about, behaved in an incomprehensible fashion: He refused to identify himself and hung up on us.

But strictly speaking, this is not the point. If we are to believe Radio Liberty, our aircraft belong to the Soviet Air Force and were being flown to Laos to be sold. But unfortunately we have been unable either to confirm or deny this information.

The Defense Ministry press center stated that the military has nothing to do with this matter and these are obviously civil aircraft. The Ministry of Civil Aviation said that it is unaware both of what has happened and of the ownership of the aircraft. And A. Pavlov, deputy general director of "Aviaeksport," after hastily saying "There were no deals, the aircraft aren't ours," was quick to get away...

We await the denouement.

Soviet Planes Allowed to Continue Flight to Laos

LD2806052991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0140 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Boris Chekhonin]

[Text] Bangkok, 28 Jun (TASS)—Four Soviet AN-2 planes with crew members, experts, and a Lao navigator, left for Vientiane on 27 June. The planes had made a forced landing on 22 June in Udon Thani Province in Thailand due to a shortage of fuel and stormy weather.

The decision to allow the planes to continue their flight from Vietnam to Laos was made by the authorities after a special commission of the Thai Air Force came to the conclusion that the Soviet planes were not carrying out any intelligence mission over the territory of Thailand.

Near East & South Asia

Iraqi Position on UN Inspections Analyzed

PM2806101091 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report datelined 27 June: "'Dangerous Precedent'"]

[Text] On Wednesday the Iraqi authorities permitted UN inspectors to visit the military base in Baghdad where they had twice refused to allow them to go, on Sunday and Tuesday. Baghdad justified its refusal on the grounds that there was a Muslim holiday on those days. The UN Security Council assessed these actions as a "dangerous precedent" and a violation of the cease-fire

conditions. UN representatives were to inspect the base to verify whether there were at the base any weapons of mass destruction, which Iraq has pledged to destroy. On Wednesday no components suitable for the production of nuclear or chemical weapons were found at the base.

According to data received from American satellites and submitted to the Security Council, in the period from Sunday through Wednesday equipment was being removed from the base, presumably equipment designed for enriching uranium with a view to its use in nuclear weapons. American intelligence, NBC television notes in this connection, believes that Iraq already has sufficient such uranium to make at least one nuclear bomb. In the opinion of the intelligence service, the Baghdad regime "is back to its old games, and is trying to conceal not only nuclear technology, but also missiles and poison gas."

These events prompted a sharp reaction by the White House. President Bush accused Iraq of concealing its nuclear weapon production program from international inspection, while Secretary of State Baker stated: "We think that the UN resolutions should be fully complied with. We were saying the same in the period between 2 August last year and 15 January this year." CBS television assessed Baker's words as a veiled threat of military action.

REUTER cites an anonymous official Kurdish spokesman, who claimed that the Iraqi authorities are still making chemical weapons and stockpiling them near the city of Mosul. According to this spokesman's statement, information obtained by Kurdish rebel intelligence will be handed over to the allied forces.

Various Iraqi opposition groupings have decided to resume mass popular actions against the Saddam Husayn regime. Citing representatives of the Iraqi opposition, the Egyptian newspaper AL-WAFD writes that intensive consultations are currently taking place among anti-Saddam forces based outside Iraq on the convocation of a conference to formulate a concrete action program to step up resistance to the present Iraqi regime.

Iraqi President Saddam Husayn, Iraqi television reported, has accused his enemies in the recent Persian Gulf war of seeking to isolate him from the people. He said that "the main target of aggression was relations between Saddam Husayn and his people."

As of today there are still 578,000 Iraqi refugees in Iran, and another 600,000 or so Iraqis have returned home, Iranian Interior Minister A. Nuri announced Wednesday. The refugees who still remain in Iran have expressed the intention to return to Iraq only when their safety is guaranteed.

The Kuwaiti authorities have commuted the death penalty on 29 people charged with collaboration with the Iraqi occupying forces to life imprisonment.

Nuclear Inspection Refusal Viewed

PM2806094591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by V. Lashkul: "Is Baghdad Concealing Nuclear Devices?"]

[Excerpts] 'Abd-al-Amir al-Anbari, the Iraqi permanent UN representative, has accused the Security Council of "blackmail" aimed at retaining the embargo on international trade with his country.

The reason for this grave accusation was the statement by IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] Director H. Blix disseminated at the headquarters of the world community in connection with reports that Baghdad has secret devices for the production of enriched uranium. These reports are based on information from an Iraqi deserter, an engineer by profession, to the effect that work on the creation of nuclear weapons is continuing in the mountain regions in the north of the country. [passage omitted]

Let us recall that after its military defeat in the Persian Gulf Iraq officially agreed to UN monitoring of the destruction of its chemical and biological weapons and also of ballistic missiles and materials which could be used to create nuclear weapons. In the light of this Baghdad's categorical refusal to allow a group of international experts to visit one of its nuclear establishments looks very worrying. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Sends Congratulations to India's Rao

PM2606100591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 91 Second Edition p 7

[Message from USSR President M. Gorbachev to Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao on his appointment]

[Text] To His Excellency Indian Prime Minister Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao

Please accept my cordial congratulations on your appointment as Indian prime minister.

People in the Soviet Union know you well as a prominent Indian politician and statesman, a loyal comrade-in-arms of Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi, and a sincere friend of our country.

I am sure that in assuming the difficult duties of head of government at such a difficult time for India you will undoubtedly vindicate the Indian people's hopes in you.

We highly value our close friendly ties with India. Our cooperation in international affairs on the basis of the noble principles of the Soviet-Indian Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation and the Delhi Declaration remains an invariable constant in the world community's efforts to build a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

Now that the USSR and India are traveling the difficult road of political and socioeconomic renewal, the mutual trust and support that have always distinguished relations between our peoples are particularly important.

Let me take this opportunity to send you, Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister, my warmest congratulations on your 70th birthday. I wish you good health and success in your activity for the good of the Indian people.

[Signed] USSR President M.S Gorbachev

East Europe

Vremya Warns of 'Terrible Explosion' in SFRY

LD2706205991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Commentary by Vadim Lobachenko—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The dramatic escalation of the Yugoslav crisis is continuing. The latest spiral of events was sparked off by the unilateral declaration of independence by two republics belonging to the Yugoslav federation, Slovenia and Croatia. The federal authorities have pronounced these decisions illegal and have instructed the Yugoslav People's Army to get the situation under control. Throughout today tank units of the Yugoslav Army have been advancing on Ljubljana, the main city in Slovenia, and moving on checkpoints along the country's border with the outside world. The Yugoslav Army has already taken control of the most important crossing points, on the border with Austria and Italy.

Milan Kucan, president of Slovenia, has appealed to the population, urging the territorial defense forces and all Slovenes to take up arms against the federal army's aggression, as he put it. Trucks and buses have been used to block roads in Slovenia. [passage omitted]

So, tanks and the army are being used as the ultimate means of saving the country from disintegration. Nobody knows how effective this will be. After all, the Yugoslav Army is not a homogenous body either, although it is a highly disciplined force and the overwhelming majority of its servicemen favor the preservation of a united, multi-ethnic Yugoslavia, the Yugoslavia which has endured in spite of all the trials and tribulations since 1918.

Unquestionably the explosion of nationalism and separatism in Yugoslavia is now worrying not just Yugoslavs but the rest of the world too. The majority view is unequivocal: the declarations of independence in Slovenia and Croatia are destabilizing the situation in Europe. In this connection the NEW YORK TIMES says that neither the United States nor the European Community recognize the independence of these two republics. Western leaders remember well that the roots of the First World War go back to the nationalism and extremism of this area.

[Video shows U.S. Secretary of State Baker addressing a meeting; Lobachenko translates Baker's remarks into Russian]: What I see happening in Yugoslavia is the inability of certain leaders of the republics to realize the dangerous consequences of their actions. The liklihood of still more violence, bloodshed and collapse is increasing. This is truly a powderkeg situation.

[Commentary resumes] It is in the interests of Yugoslavs and the entire world to prevent a terrible explosion. But this cannot be avoided if extremism, ultimata and violence are not renounced, if the path of talks and compromise is not regained. There is simply no other way of restoring peace and prosperity. [video: foreign footage of tanks arriving at border posts and demolishing roadblocks]

Last Soviet Soldier Leaves CSFR

LD2706162491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1508 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Prague, 27 June. (TASS)—TASS correspondent Anatoliy Shapovalov: The last serviceman of the former central group of troops [CGT] of the Soviet Army, which has been in Czechoslovakia since 1968, left the CSFR today. He was Colonel General Eduard Vorobyev, the CGT commander.

During our stay in Czechoslovakia, E. Vorobyev said, the Soviet government consistently adhered to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state. The task of withdrawing the troops has been carried out successfully. Good conditions have been created for the building up of essentially new Czechoslovak-Soviet ties.

Remaining on the territory of the CSFR there are now 25 Soviet experts who, together with Czechoslovak specialists, have to resolve the problems of the property and financial settlement between the CSFR and the USSR.

Bulgarian President Comments on USSR Relations

PM2706101991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Union Edition p 7

[A. Kapralov report: "No Attachment to the Superpowers. Bulgaria's President on Foreign Policy Priorities"]

[Text] Sofia—Speaking on television on Sunday evening, President Zhelyu Zhelev touched on certain important aspects of Bulgaria's foreign policy, in particular its relations with the USSR and prospects for the signing of a new treaty between our countries.

The president pointed out that there have been magnificent changes in Europe and throughout the world, thanks to which Bulgaria can take a different approach to the quest for guarantors of its national security. But that does not mean that it is necessary to rush out of the arms of one "superpower"—the USSR—into the arms of another: the United States. We must, Zh. Zhelev

stressed, realize once and for all that we cannot be asked to attach ourselves to one "great force" that will guarantee our security in exchange for our playing a servile role.

The president said that experts are working on the treaty that is to be signed with the USSR, but it can be said even now that the term of validity of the old treaty will not be extended and there will be no military sections in the new treaty that could call into question Bulgaria's sovereignty and national independence. In the president's opinion, corresponding treaties will probably be concluded with the individual republics, which are, Zh. Zhelev pointed out, becoming autonomous states.

Zh. Zhelev described Boris Yeltsin's election as Russian president as an event of exceptional importance. Zhelev recalled Yeltsin's promise to visit Bulgaria first if he was elected president. "We magnanimously forgive him since it is more important for him to determine his position as regards relations between Russia and the United States, but we hope that his next trip will be to Bulgaria. We will welcome Yeltsin as Russia's first democratically elected president and that state's first noncommunist leader."

Walesa Interviewed on Situation in Poland

PM2706131191 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No 21, 26 May 91 (signed to press 21 May 91) p 13

[Interview with Polish President Lech Walesa by correspondent Valeriy Masterov at the Belweder Palace, Warsaw; date of interview not stated: "Lech Walesa: 'We Want to Win the Argument With Time'"]

[Text] Valeriy Masterov: Mr. President, during your recent trip to the United States, you stated: "I am not a president in the classical sense, but I am ready for work." What did you have in mind, also taking into consideration the assertion from your recently released book "The Road to Freedom": "I was always primarily a practical man, and less of an ideologist"?

Lech Walesa: I really am not a president in the classical sense, as presidents are generally imagined to be: Tall, elegant, lean, imposing, speaking several languages, and educated at a professional political school. Some politicians studied at Marxist-Leninist schools, and others studied political science in the West. I did neither. What is more, I look at everything through the filter of practice, for life has taught me that this is the only way problems can be solved. I have experienced at first hand all of fortune's vicissitudes: I have been a peasant, a manual worker, then headed a trade union which broke the communist system. I have never built theories or any ideological programs. I always want to be myself, true to what I feel when I talk to people.

Valeriy Masterov: In an interview with MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI last August you spoke of the "necessity for there to be a right and left leg," meaning political balance. Has this been achieved to any degree at all in Poland today?

Lech Walesa: A normal social and political life demands diversity. It is only necessary to be able to bring this diversity together along a single avenue of activity. Poland, with all its problems, wants to enter a Europe which is not divided into East and West, but a Europe which has deep traditions going back to Christianity's beginnings and the Mediterranean culture, where integrated political culture took shape. It is within the framework of this very culture that we see a place for various political parties and streams—from left-wing to right-wing forces, and from Christian to national forces.

It is only now that the whole political spectrum is clearly visible in Poland. But the time has not yet come for creating the "right and left leg", although we are striving for this. As someone has calculated, there are almost 200 political parties in Poland at the moment. True, there are some whose membership can fit on one single sofa. And the first test for all political groups will be the parliamentary elections. As you know, our present parliamentary system is the product of a political contract concluded at the "round table" two years ago. At that time Solidarity reached an accord with the Communists, and the transition from the one system of power to the other was worked out. As you well know, this was not easy. And when the PZPR [Polish United Workers' Party] dissolved itself, it became possible to bring about what could be described as the creation of a new political life. During the parliamentary elections it will acquire a completely new expression. And I must say that, for me as president, the left-wing stream is just as important as the right-wing one. Of course, I personally am very emotionally attached to the Christian tendency; I always emphasize this, I do not want anyone to forget this. But I want to be the president of all Poles, including those who want to act from socialist or communist positions for Poland's good. All my actions are intended to make Poland a place for all Poles, irrespective of what kind of past they have.

[Text]Valeriy Masterov: Talking with you, I cannot help but ask about Solidarity, with which your name is still associated in many people's minds. Has not the Solidarity of August 1980 nevertheless remained a trade union belonging to a single generation? Is there not disappointment among those who, together with you, defended Solidarity in the struggle, and who today, no longer with Walesa, are upholding the same demands: Higher living standards, better labor conditions, and the resolution of the employment problem?

Lech Walesa: The situation is completely different now. The Solidarity of that period embraced everything—it was a party as well as a trade union, a social movement, and a creative union. It was a Christmas tree where everybody hung their decorations: Taxi drivers, peasants, pharmacists, dockers, miners... At that time, when we were struggling for freedom and the main demand—

for pluralism in society, politics, and trade unions—was met, it became clear that there was no necessity for such a large organism to be functioning. All political life has, as you have noted, shifted from Solidarity towards the political groups. And this is very good. The movement is being cleansed. The trade union is becoming a trade union. And naturally, it does not have to be so strong, as it does not have to overturn communism, it has only to strengthen the realm of freedom, shifting the main emphasis to establishing political parties, trade unions, and creative unions.

Of course, those who only thought in terms of a large trade union, are disappointed today. And those who thought in terms of political changes, see an immense difference between the Poland of 1980 and 1991. The transition from the edict system to the free market is a painful operation which has an effect on everybody. Even slogans such as "Return, Commune" are appearing. You see, previously there was no need to stop and think about anything—there were ready solutions for all eventualities in life. Now—after people have lived more than 40 years in a system where everything was ordained, shared out, or handed out—it has turned out that they have to fight for everything. This involves a change of mentality and the way of life; a psychological transformation. Therefore, the generation which defended Solidarity in the struggle is also divided.

Valeriy Masterov: To all appearances, you resolutely support the "Balcerowicz plan." But the transition to a market economy still does not enjoy universal support in Polish society. Having stated that "We want to be the America of the East," how do you intend to convince people of the necessity for market relations?

Lech Walesa: We cannot retreat if we want to be a modern state, if we want to join the 21st century. We want to win the argument with time. Hence our openness in politics, our determined support for privatization, reprivatization, and the creation of a new market. Our aim is to control inflation and to create new conditions for the development of industry and the economy. But we are not in a position to change the system without support from outside. We are interested in enterprising people from the West starting up in business here themselves, putting down roots, creating an industrial base, building automobile plants, and beginning to produce computers and chemical industry goods. We ourselves are not yet utilizing all the natural wealth at our disposal. It is for this reason that I am saying that we want to be the America of the East. Therefore, I am also urging the sinking of Western, U.S., and in general world capital in our structures, so that they can become acquainted with all the problems of postcommunist countries, and in that sense gain experience. As well as to open up the very large Soviet market.

Valeriy Masterov: Poland is energetically breaking into Europe. How will it balance between West and East? I would also like you to comment on your recent statement: "We are in favor of a unified Europe, including the USSR."

Lech Walesa: Civilization, like nature, does not recognize borders. The hare never asks: Is this the Czech, Polish, or Soviet border? It just bounds over to where there is something to eat. Only man has created artificial barriers. Different standards of living now prevail in different states. We do not want a new barrier—"a prosperity curtain"—to descend along the Elbe now that the "iron curtain" has gone. We are not at all indifferent as to what we are going to produce and what you are going to produce. We are also concerned—just like the whole of Europe—with the fact that it was in your country that Chernobyl exploded. It is important to know what toys your neighbor is playing with. Europe must think about the community, preserving, of course, the individuality of each people. You see, it is not a question of changing the political borders—that is beyond discussion. It is a question of access to technology, of exchange of experience in reforms. This applies to the Soviet Union as well. You are our largest neighbor, and logic dictates that we constantly have good-neighbor contacts as sovereign and equal states. The USSR is a natural market for our products. We have many differences, but a solution can always be found if there is the desire to do so on both sides.

Valeriy Masterov: Where do you see a coincidence of positions in the newly developing Soviet-Polish relations, and what, in your view, needs to be amended, what should be abandoned? What could you say about a future visit to the Soviet Union?

Lech Walesa: We want our contacts to be those of partners, not reflecting an artificial friendship between governments but a genuine friendship between peoples. Even two years ago, after my first invitation to visit the USSR as Solidarity's chairman, I drew attention to the problems whose solution would have been a prerequisite for the visit: The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland, and the possibility to visit USSR territories associated with Polish history and culture, as well as places of Polish martyrdom including Katyn. There has been no practical response to this day. When Soviet Ambassador Yuriy Kashlev handed me the invitation to visit the USSR, already as president of the Republic of Poland, I once more returned to these problems. If we want cooperation, we must create the conditions for an open dialogue and the exhaustive explanation of all issues. Problem number one is now the stationing of Soviet troops on Polish territory. We hope that a sensible solution will be found. We are not talking about chasing the Soviet Army out or demeaning it. Not at all.

The Soviet Union has always had a great significance for us, but until now our relations have developed disproportionately. We want them to be built on the principles of independence and sovereignty. A visit to the Soviet Union cannot be a visit for its own sake. It must be a

visit which will lay the foundations for a new dimension in our relations, and allow our peoples to satisfy themselves of this.

West Europe

Pavlov Continues Visit to Austria

Meets Chancellor Vranitzky

LD2706153991 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Vienna June 27 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov arrived in Austria on a three-day official visit today. He was invited by Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky and the Austrian Government.

On the same day, Pavlov and Vranitsky held talks. They discussed in depth the present state and prospects for Soviet-Austrian interaction mindful of sweeping changes in Europe and the world and drastic transformations in the Soviet Union. The talks passed in an atmosphere of goodwill and openness typical of relations between the two countries.

Pavlov and Vranitzky expressed satisfaction with the achieved level of Soviet-Austrian relations which are built on equality, trust and mindfulness of each other's interests. Much attention was paid to trade, economic and scientific-technical cooperation.

It was pointed out that trade between the two countries developed unevenly lately. The difficulties of the transition period encountered by the USSR also affected its foreign economic ties with Austria. The Austrian side showed understanding of these difficulties. During the exchange of views, the sides agreed to find opportunities for paying off the remaining part of the debt and also to take other measures to stabilise trade.

The sides favoured expanding and deepening cooperation that meets the vital interests of the peoples of the USSR and Austria, the cause of strengthening peace and European stability. They shared a similar view that the transition to market relations in the Soviet Union called for new effective forms of interaction, such as developing joint ventures, encouraging investment activity and forming and updating direct links.

The two statesmen also discussed issues related to the rapid growth of contacts between the two countries' citizens. In this regard, they pointed to the need to regulate issues affecting citizens' socio-labour and other rights. It was agreed to continue the work of Soviet and Austrian competent agencies that began here.

The sides stated their countries' readiness to continue to promote the European CSCE process. They assessed positively the results achieved at the Berlin conference of the foreign ministers of the CSCE member-nations.

In the afternoon, Pavlov laid a wreath at the monument of Soviet soldiers who died in the fighting to liberate Austria from Nazi occupation, which is installed on Schwarzenbergplatz Square. Pavlov also laid a wreath at the memorial to the victims of the struggle for Austria's freedom.

Pavlov then visited the Vienna town hall where he made an entry in the "gold book" of the city's honourable guests.

Vranitzky Hosts Dinner

LD2706195391 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Vienna June 27 TASS—Austria's Chancellor Franz Vranitzky gave a dinner for visiting Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, on behalf of the federal government.

Having highly assessed the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Austria, based on understanding and common interests, the chancellor welcomed "democratic developments in the Soviet Union within the framework of perestroika". Vranitzky said the process was not without its problems and even failures, but "the events of the past few days instill hope in its further positive development".

If in the past, Vranitzky continued, relations between Austria and the Soviet Union were characterised by exchanges of specialists, painters, scientists, and students in accordance with inter-state agreements, they are now replaced by interpersonal contacts of the two countries without state interference.

Official contacts through well-trodden routes are being replaced with direct, free relationships between enterprises, research establishments and ordinary people.

Such important shifts could be possible only due to the policy of perestroika and glasnost in the USSR, the chancellor added, stressing that "this new dimension of personal contacts and initiatives signals progress in building a common European house".

Democratic changes in eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, their turn towards universal human values, Pavlov said, opened the way for solving many problems that had recently seemed intractable. One can only welcome the fact that neutral Austria, following the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of these states, gives them assistance in pursuing reform, shares experience of the operation of democratic institutions and contributes to stabilising the situation in the region.

Having embarked on the path of radical transformations, he continued, the Soviet Union bases itself on the fact that these changes benefit the Soviet people and, eventually, the peoples of Europe and the World. According to him, the current reforms in the Soviet Union help overcome the split in Europe, pave the way

towards a broad-based interaction and cooperation in economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields.

The Soviet prime minister highly assessed the state treaty on restoration of independent and democratic Austria, signed in 1955 by the four victor nations and the Alpine republic. The treaty enabled Austria to become a full-fledged member of the world community.

"For us," Pavlov stressed, "the state treaty and the status of Austria's permanent neutrality, organically linked to it, continue to be the foundation on which the edifice of Soviet-Austrian relations rests."

Discusses Economic Cooperation

LD2806104391 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna June 28 TASS—The Second day of Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's official visit to Austria proved eventful and fruitful. Pavlov is currently here at the invitation of Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky and the Austrian Government.

Main attention during the talks in Vienna is being given to bilateral relations, primarily to trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation.

This is understandable: The Soviet Union ranks tenth among Austria'a leading trading partners. Soviet deliveries are of considerable importance for meeting the central European country's import requirements.

Last year, according to the press, the Soviet Union accounted for more than 90 per cent of the Austrian import of natural gas, and over 30 per cent of iron ore. Reciprocal trade grew by 70 per cent compared to 1980. At the same time trade between the two counries developed unevenly of late and therefore an important task is to elevate cooperation to a proper level.

This idea was voiced during Pavlov's meeting with Heinz Fischer, president of the National Council (parliament). The interlocutors spoke out in favour of stimulating bilateral contacts in various fields.

They pointed out the need for further refinement of the legal basis of Soviet-Austrian relations to reflect qualitative chabnges taking place on the European continent and to accord with the present-day development.

Kohl Receives Velichko in Bonn

LD2706211991 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By correspondent Alexander Semyonov]

[Text] Bonn June 27 TASS—German Chancellor Helmut Kohl today received USSR First Deputy Premier Vladimir Velichko, staying here for the holding of a regular [word indistinct] Soviet-German mixed commision on economic, scientific and technological cooperation.

During the meeting the head of the German Government said that he attaches much importance to the forthcoming talks with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in Kiev and the subsequent meeting in the framework of the Group of Seven in London.

There was a brief exchange of opinions on the economic situation in the Soviet Union. Velichko said the Soviet side welcomes foreign capital investments in the USSR. Some specific projects of interest for both sides were also discussed.

Correspondent Said To Seek Asylum in West

PM2706140791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by S. Pluzhnikov and S. Frolov: "He Got Off the 'Tribune'"]

[Text] Radio Liberty has reported the case of two Soviet "defectors." A Soviet trade representative has requested political asylum in Norway. Mikhail Butkov, a newspaper correspondent in Oslo, has also requested political asylum in a Western country.

We managed to find out with the help of Norwegian journalists that Andrey Soprukin, the 29-year-old Soviet trade representative in Norway, is currently with the police. And we were informed by Bjorn Blokhus, the press spokesman for the Norwegian Foreign Ministry, that his future will be decided not by the government but by the police—these are the rules. Previously, before the era of glasnost and perestroyka in our country, any Soviet official requesting political asylum received it automatically. But now every case of this sort is considered on an individual basis, and Soprukin's chances of getting a residence permit are very slim. The case of Mikhail Butkov, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA's correspondent in Oslo, is far more complicated. He disappeared from his home 22 May, leaving his car, all his money, and also his wife and two children (Butkov's family is now in Moscow).

The Norwegian press is currently putting forward two versions of M. Butkov's disappearance. Some journalists think that he fled for personal reasons. Other newpapers are inclined to believe that M. Butkov worked for the KGB and is a common deserter, of whom there have been a great many recently.

Whatever the case, the Norwegian Embassy in the USSR has not yet replied to two notes from RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA's editorial office. "Butkov is not in Norway, he is in a third country," we were informed by Bjorn Blokhus from the Norwegian Foreign Affairs Ministry. The Soviet Interpol service has sent an official inquiry about M. Butkov's disappearance to the Norwegian authorities.

Report on European TV Project Meeting

PM2706153391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
21 Jun 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by V. Shmyganovskiy: "A Single Information Space Is Being Created on Our Continent: The Television Screens of the European Home"]

[Text] Helsinki—A meeting of representatives of the pan-European Eureka Audiovisual Project [EAP] was held in Helsinki. Its aim was to create a single information space on our continent and to meet the clear desire of West Europeans to limit the penetration of U.S. television and cinema and the expansion of Japanese technology, especially in the electronic mass media.

The EAP, set up in 1989 on the initiative of French President Mitterrand, brings together 26 states, including the USSR. The future common European home is inconceivable without the exchange of movies, television programs, technology, and audiovisual systems—above all in the sphere of high-definition television.

The new chairman of the EAP Coordinators' Committee, Jukka Liedes from the Finnish Education Ministry, was presented at the meeting. A Nordic country will head this pan-European organization, then it will be the Soviet Union's turn. The organization will be directed by the EAP Secretariat, based in Brussels.

"Eureka's example shows how large-scale cooperation among such diverse countries can be effectively established without bureaucracy," Jukka Liedes said.

Judge for yourselves how important such cooperation is: According to Italian Foreign Ministry figures, 90 television channels, 40 of which are Europe-wide, operate in West Europe alone. They are served by 10 communications satellites. There are 125,000 hours of television broadcast per annum, but only 20,000 are related to European events. We, however, have cut ourselves off from this abundance by an "information curtain," created mainly through the backwardness of our equipment and technology. Therefore, it is not yet clear whether the international "Euronews" program, which from 1992 will transmit initially for nine hours a day and then around the clock, will be received in our homes. "Euronews" should become a serious competitor to America's CNN program.

As far as EAP is concerned, the USSR, which has involved itself enthusiastically in its work, is the only major state which has not yet paid its contributions—almost 160,000 ecus. The Brussels Secretariat seems to have grown tired of reminding us about this debt. But if Eureka's screens do go blank on us, we will have deprived ourselves not only of entertainment, informative, and other programs made throughout Europe, but also of access to the most advanced technology.

Greek CP Leader Interviewed on Visit to Moscow

PM2806091591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jun 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by V. Potapov: "Alexandra Papariga: No Other Way"]

[Excerpts]Our newspaper's editorial office has received a visit from Alexandra Papariga, general secretary of the Greek Communist Party [KKE] Central Committee, and Orestis Kolozof, member of the KKE Central Committee Politburo. The previous day the Greek communist delegation had met with M.S. Gorbachev. Naturally, the first question the guests were asked was about the aims of their visit to Moscow and their impressions of their meeting.

"The aim of our visit," A. Papariga said, "is to develop closer cooperation with the CPSU and to familiarize ourselves with the country's problems at this crucial period of transition to a market economy, when the question of the new Union Treaty is being decided.

"We are just starting to elaborate our party's new program. In it we intend to set out our own views of the concept of socialism. At our last congress we concluded that socialism in the form in which it had existed did have certain achievements to its credit and had done a good deal for mankind but had been unable to overcome crisis and stagnation, and—in a number of cases—had been unable to survive. Socialism as a choice remains our aim. It is the only alternative to the current capitalist system. However, a critical analysis is needed of socialist experience, of its existing model, and—above all—of the reasons for the crisis of socialism.

"If I don't count a brief encounter four years ago I can say that this was my first meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. He struck me as a lively, energetic, and assured man. I listened with interest to his views on the progress of perestroyka. I would particularly like to stress my satisfaction with the attention which he has been devoting to diverse forms of cooperation with the international communist movement in the modern era."

[Potapov] How do Greek communists assess what is happening in our country? How do they view perestroyka?

[Papariga] We believe that the ideas of perestroyka are in line with the need to reorganize socialism and are making a major contribution to the development of a modern theory of socialism. The ideas of perestroyka have made socialism more attractive. Of course, we make no secret of the fact that we are following with concern the progress that perestroyka is making. We can see that each attempt at renewal brings new contradictions to the fore. We are attentive to the criticism being made about mistakes committed in the initial period of this process. But we also realize that the CPSU is right to say that there is no way back. We interpret the struggle currently taking place in Soviet society as a struggle

between forces striving for the renewal of socialism and forces striving for the restoration of capitalism. Of course, against the background of this opposition there are also many other contradictions and ideological conflicts. But we are sure that, deep down, most people remain true to the ideas of socialism. [Papariga ends] [Passage omitted]

During the discussion the conversation turned to the good cooperation between our party newspapers—PRAVDA and RIZOSPASTIS.

"I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, visited Greece recently," A. Papariga said. "We recalled meeting with him on Greek soil and his talks with the RIZOSPASTIS collective. I think that the ties between our newspapers need to be developed."

O. Kolozof responded to a request to talk about the newspaper RIZOSPASTIS, which is currently going through a difficult patch.

"One of the main problems we have had to face is the problem of party journalists. The issue of journalists' work in general is currently a topical subject for all of Greek society. It is being widely discussed."

Supreme Soviet

Committee Discusses Dacha Costs for Elite

LD2706135791

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian at 0900 GMT on 27 June carries an eight-minute report by correspondent Olga Vasilenko on this morning's USSR Supreme Soviet session which is working in committees and commissions. Part of the committees and commissions are in the Kremlin discussing the population's employment problems. The legislation of the Union and union republics on employment is to come into force on 1 July, she says.

At Prospekt Kalinina 27, Vasilenko continues, "the commission on issues of privileges and benefits is conducting a parliamentary hearing on the construction, use, and sale of the dacha stocks of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and central ministries and deparments. If one is to decode all the figures and facts, the situation is as follows: During the construction of dachas for leading staff of the Ministry of Defense, for example, even the estimated costs of these dachas—40,000-45,000 rubles [R]—permitted by the government, when inflated, amounts to more than R210,000."

She notes that this is the cost of each dacha, and goes on: "And the total cost of the construction of dachas for military leaders of the Ministry of Defense amounts to R3,782,000."

Next, Vasilenko says: "Now on the use of dachas. I shall cite just one fact, taking the example of the dacha settlement in Uspenskoye of which the cost of electricity for 1990 amounted to R6,680, of which R1,372 have been paid. It turns out that they do not have electricity meters there. And yet another problem is the sale of dachas and property. Such creeping privatization. There is no legislative act relating to this, but the sale is going on, and one has to say that issues are being decided very, very energetically."

She adds that this even applies to state dachas and she reads from documents: "On 28 July 1990, at the dacha settlement of Zhukovka, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov concludes a purchase and sale agreement, on the sale of dacha No. 2 for R35,359. On 31 July 1990 this agreement was registered at the Odintsovo bureau of technical information, after which this bureau of technical information makes a revaluation of the dacha. Its price becomes R78,017.

"Comrades Biryukova, Voronin, Sovarkov, Shkabardnya, and Sterligov have acted in the same way, it is written here. Aleksandr Pavlovna Biryukova: A dacha with a clearance balance price of R75,331, he acquires for R18,097. The same thing is happening with the remaining dachas. What is more, as far as Voronin is concerned, until he bought this dacha he was a member of the 'Saminka' cooperative. For all that he bought this dacha. That is, dachas are being marketed at discounted prices, and the loss thereby incurred is R206,226."

Vasilenko says that the deputies are now discussing who will be brought to account for allowing this: "It is not just a matter of dachas being sold at discounted prices. There are other facts. The cost of heating pipes, electric lighting, roads, and other communications are not taken into account. And the loss caused by all this is R200,000." She cites the example of central heating being installed at a dacha, while the official occupying it does not pay anything. She goes on to cite the thousands of rubles worth of electricity used but there are no meters to indicate how much people have to pay, so much smaller amounts are in fact being paid.

She continues: "Now here is another interesting thing. The sale of the property that was in state dachas. It is state dachas that are being sold here. They are being sold for private use, but the splendid furniture that is in them is immediately being sold. In 1990 the Ministry of Defense has sold furniture, domestic appliances, and other property amounting to a sum of R122,700. Comrade Akhromeyev—R12,700, Comrade Lizev—R20,500, and so on and so forth."

Vasilenko goes on to say that such questions were asked as to why Akhromeyev needed three Zil refrigerators which cost him R215, while Marshal Sokolov paid R29 for a similar unit. Vasilenko adds that Akhromeyev was not present, although he is a Supreme Soviet deputy.

She concludes by referring to the words of Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin when he was Minister of Internal Affairs that "authority in our country is not subordinate to any laws."

Political & Social

Yakovlek Denies Attempt To Split Party

PM2706230391 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 28 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by Anatoliy Yurkov: "Who Is Provoking Split?]

[Text] Over the last few days some of the mass media, citing one another, foreign sources, or no one at all, have been printing the names of V. Bakatin, E. Shevardnadze, A. Yakovlev, and certain other well-known Communists. Their names are being linked with a split in the party that they are allegedly preparing. A date is even given: Wednesday, 26 June, of this year. On that day they will supposedly issue statements saying that they are quitting the CPSU in order to set up their own party.

Wednesday has gone; no statement arrived. On the other hand, fresh conjecture appeared, generated not just by the newspapers but also by radio "voices."

I telephoned A.N. Yakovlev. His assistant answered and said that he was in the hospital.

I telephoned the hospital. The ailing and traditionally correct Aleksandr Nikolayevich suddenly became "enraged."

[Yakovlev] Tell me, who wants to make me out to be a splittist? Obviously the people who are pushing the party toward disintegration, the people who are trying to resurrect in it the spirit and usages of times past.

[Yurkov] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, did you make the statement about your quitting the party that TRUD, KOMSOMOLKA, and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA have mentioned?

[Yakovlev] I have written a statement regarding those articles.

[Yurkov] Can we publish it?

[Yakovlev] Yes, in Saturday's edition.

[Yurkov] Are you finding this difficult?

Yakovlev] There is hardly anyone who would find it easy to undergo this kind of coordinated and massive persecution. [Yakovlev ends]

So, in tomorrow's edition of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA you can read Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev's statement as to whether he is preparing a split in the party.

Officials on Possible New Party, CPSU Split

LD2806051491 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Contrary to predictions in right-wing and left-wing newspapers, there was no announcement today of the establishment of any new, popular, democratic party in our country. Nevertheless, talk of the appearance of such a party in the near future is far from a rumor. The "Vesti" program had the opportunity today to find this out as a result of several confidential conversations with very well-informed people who are close to leading political figures in our country. We have no reason not to trust our informants, but we have no right yet to reveal their names. One thing is clear: the emergence of a strong party that is an alternative to the CPSU is far from being something out of political fiction.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent S. Dorenko] The main concern of the CPSU apparatus on Staraya Ploshchad [Central Committee Headquarters in Moscow] today is to prove to the people that the party is internally stable. They talk about pluralism and their 16 million members, but it seems there is nobody any more who doubts that the CPSU is on the verge of a split. Nina Andreyeva's orthodox bolshevik are of no importance. What is more dangerous for the nomenklatura is the activity of Aleksandr Rutskov, who is creating a democratic party of communists of Russia out of part of the CPSU. According to the organizers' estimates, many people will leave the communists and join this new party.

[Rutskoy] This figure is already fluctuating somewhere around 3.5 to 3.8 million communists.

[Dorenko] The CPSU would have tried to sort out Ruskoy's movement, if only the friendship between the nomenklatura and Gorbachev had not been undermined by the president's concessions to the republics. The huge economic corporation known as the CPSU felt that the general secretary was not defending its interests. It tried to rebel and antagonized Gorbachev even more. Today the president is interested in the centrists from the CPSU, Aleksandr Rutskoy, and the diffuse democratic miniparties, managing to find a common language and to guarantee him organized support from the left. Meanwhile, the CPSU Central Committee may still be convincing itself of its own power, but it is not convincing us.

[Russian Communist Party leader Ivan Polozkov] The absolute majority of key positions in state structures from the level of the rural Soviet to the USSR Congress People's Deputies, is occupied by communists.

[Dorenko] However, even conservatives have already lost faith in the present CPSU. That counts for something.

["Soyuz" cochairman Viktor Alksnis] The CPSU is today falling apart before our eyes. Therefore, the time has obviously come when what is needed is the establishment of some kind of new political party, capable, among other things, of uniting our state with the help of its own party structures. [end recording]

I think that Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze would also subscribe to Colonel Alksnis' last words there, although, of coure, they are thinking about the establishment of completely different parties.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on CPSU Investigation

PM2806102591 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No. 25, Jun 91 (signed to press 18 Jun 91) p 13

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze by correspondent Anatoliy Kovrigin under the "Political Life" rubric, datelined Vienna; no date of interview given; first two paragraphs are an introduction: "He Spoke—They 'Acted'"]

[Text] Many people here in Austria were simply discouraged by the lightning speed with which a "case was instituted" against one of the universally recognized architects of the policy of perestroyka, former member of the Politburo, and currently member of the CPSU Central Committee. After all, hardly more than 24 hours elapsed between his address to representatives of Austrian business and public circles, when he publicly formulated the idea of creating a new political party for the

supporters of reforms, and the adoption of organizational conclusions in Moscow, based on an appeal by Communists to the CPSU Central Control Commission. It was, incidentally, a 24-hour period which mostly coincided with the day off for the Russian elections.

As soon as the teleprinter stopped its chatter and produced the report on the decision adopted in Moscow's Staraya Ploshchad [site of the CPSU Central Committee building], I managed to locate Eduard Shevardnadze and asked for his comment on what had happened.

[Shevardnadze] My reaction to this is calm and cool. I am not afraid of an investigation, but the actual formulation carried a whiff of the spirit of the thirties. What is there to investigate? Everything to do with me is clear and my positions are defined. I have made no secret of them to this day. I have my own personal opinion and have expressed it on other issues as well. What the party needs to investigate are primarily the causes of everything that has shaken our entire country and the whole world. I do not know the basis on which this decision was adopted. As far as I know, my Vienna speeches were not published in the Soviet press, nobody got in touch with me, no explanations were requested.

[Kovrigin] In view of the menacing uproar, do you still deem it necessary to create a new party?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, I am convinced of this. We need a force which could provide a base... Such a party could be joined by all democratically thinking people regardless of the parties to which they have belonged or to which they currently belong. The main point is that this party should have a clear-cut action program which the voters can understand.

It seems to me that the time when elections could be won on the basis of criticism, on the basis of a negative "program" built on the principle of "this is what we are against," has passed. A party which wants to win the next election—and it may be held as early as next year in the event of the "nine plus one" accord being implemented—will have to state in its program not only what it stands for but also the specific actions it intends to take, the way it intends to redistribute financial and material resources in the economy's market sector, and how it intends to stimulate the growth of production and business activeness in the country. There is a political base for such a party, and it will expand in parallel with the expansion of creative principles in economic life and the development of entrepreneurship and market structures. I think that it would also be able to count on support from major industrial and scientific associations, from the coal industry enterprises which have now been given an opportunity to operate autonomously. It is understandable that such a party, a party of reforms, must thoroughly elaborate a program for citizens' social protection. Here it would be useful to take advantage of the Western countries' experience, to borrow from them programs for the support of population groups which need it. We will have to clearly tell the voters that the faster the necessary reforms are implemented, the sooner will we be in a position to better protect the low-income population categories. The new party must proclaim itself as the party of deeds, actions, and hopes. If such a party is successfully created and organizational work for its participation in elections is properly set up, the country may end up with a parliament capable of giving scope to creative productive forces and of launching our society's economic and spiritual rebirth.

I believe that all this is feasible. Moreover, it is incumbent upon the country's democratic forces to accomplish it. As to the time we will need to finally reform our political and economic system and make it effective and efficient, this is a different matter. One point is clear: It will take years. How many? A major role here will be played by external support for our reforms and the extent to which the Soviet economy gets involved in the world economic system.

[Kovrigin] But what impact will the new party's emergence have on our country's political landscape?

[Shevardnadze] If such a party is created, this will lead to substantial changes in the entire deployment of forces. It will be able to become very useful and necessary, it will become a necessary feature of a democratic society. Actually, I am not talking about any personal desire for power on my part. What I really want to do is to help Gorbachev. After all, nowadays he has virtually nobody on whom he can rely. Conservatives are advancing on him from all sides of the wall. We are talking about the emergence of a new force, a serious and reliable force.

Incidentally, I assume that we also need an opposition. The shaping of a constructive and sensible opposition is something perfectly natural and very important. This will assist our society's onward advance. After all, a rule-of-law state cannot function with an opposition.

[Kovrigin] When could we expect the new party to appear? A year, a month hence?

[Shevardnadze] It is needed now. I have no doubt about that. As to whether our society is ready for it or not, this is a different question. But I am convinced that many people will follow such a party.

[Kovrigin] Do you not feel that you are on our own, do you have any support?

[Shevardnadze] I am a man of convictions and principles. Even if I were left on my own, I would still uphold my ideas and would consistently pursue my policy. [Shevardnadze ends]

...It was approaching midnight, Eduard Amvrosiyevich had just finished a hard day: Meetings, conversations, a brilliantly delivered lecture in the chock-full auditorium of the "Austria" International Congress Center. Hitting the road again tomorrow... On parting, Shevardnadze once more brought up the news report from Moscow: "A major mistake has been made. I assumed that such things were no longer possible in our country. But..."

CPSU Concerned About Weakening Position

LD2706201191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—The Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee has expressed concern at the weakening of the position of the party in the working environment and has called for a Central Committee plenum to be held on this problem.

The CPSU and the workers' movement—this was the theme of a routine session of the Secretariat, the CPSU Central Committee Press Center announced today. The session was held under the chairmanship of Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The participants in the session analyzed the situation in the USSR workers' movement. They stressed the need to implement immediate, vigorous measures to revive and strengthen the positions of the party in the working environment.

A document was prepared, defining the tasks of the party organizations in the workers' movement.

Pre-CPSU Congress Maneuvers Assessed

LD2706185891 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1645 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Famous economist Stanislav Shatalin has declared, speaking in Washington, that in the next few days—we think Monday or Tuesday—the All-union Democratic Party will be set up in the USSR. It will comprise former high-ranking officials of the Kremlin apparatus and progressively-minded members of the CPSU. Among the future founders of the party, Shatalin named Shevardnadze.

As you know, among the rebels the name of Aleksandr Yakovlev has also been mentioned. He has just refuted the report that he intends to leave the ranks of the CPSU.

According to unconfirmed unofficial information, it may be that the distribution of forces at the future congress of the communist party is being taken into account here. If many leading communists of democratic orientation leave the CPSU at this time, the conservative anti-Gorbachev coalition may obtain the majority at the Congress. This could of course lead to the election of a new general secretary. From this point of view there would be sense in Yakovlev staying in the party until the congress.

CPSU Discusses Neighborhood Political Work

PM2706141391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Where We Live. At CPSU Central Committee Commission for Renewal of Activity of Primary Party Organizations"]

[Text] A routine session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Renewal of the Activity of Primary Party Organizations has been held to comprehensively examine the organization of the party's neighborhood work among the population. Assessing the state of affairs in this sector in light of the election of the president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the session participants pointed out that the party's work on the territory must be the priority goal today and should be infused with new substance, and the entire arsenal of party influence on the masses should be exercised.

Views on the problems that exist in this sector were expressed by A.Ye. Chausov, secretary of the party committee of Chelyabinsk Metallurgical Combine; Ye.V. Kirshin, secretary of the party committee of Sverdlovsk Oblast's "Uralelektromed" Combine; A.I. Teplenichev, secretary of the party committee of Novolipetskiy Metallurgical Combine; V.I. Perov, secretary of Moscow Obkom [Oblast Party Committee]; S.A. Kalinin, first secretary of Yaroslavl Obkom; N.I. Sapozhnikov, first secretary of Udmurt Obkom; V.S. Malkovskiy, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee; and advisers to the commission—V.E. Boykov, deputy director of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Sociological Research Center, and A.K. Chernenko, rector of the Siberian Sociopolitical Institute.

There was support for the idea of widely developing diverse neighborhood structural formations and considerably renewing the forms and methods of this work with due regard for the emergent realities.

The unanimous opinion was expressed at the session that the strengthening of neighborhood political work must not lead to a relaxation of work in labor collectives, which remain the chief bases of the party's work. For the party the territorial-production principle enshrined in the CPSU Statutes remains unshakable.

The CPSU Central Committee commission also examined proposals coming from party organizations concerning the CPSU Statutes. It was pointed out that the adoption of the new Statutes created a good normative basis for renewing and democratizing the party, but at the same time it has become obvious during this period that certain points in them do not correspond to the conditions under which the party operates. It was deemed expedient to continue work on generalizing proposals concerning the CPSU Statutes.

At the commission session there was an exchange of opinions on a wide range of questions of concern to party

organizations, which are now going through a difficult period. Proposals were made to accelerate work on the CPSU Program and to convene a CPSU Central Committee plenum in the very near future.

Participating in the commission session were Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and M.I. Kodin, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission.

Early Publication of Draft CPSU Program Urged

PM2806082191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[Article by V. Salamashkin, first secretary of Kazan CPSU Gorkom, under the rubric "New CPSU Program": "Brooking No Delay"]

[Text] When IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS (No. 4, 1991) published an outline plan of the draft CPSU Program, we began to actively discuss the document with the members of elected party organs, in primary organs, and at large industrial enterprises. Moreover, in order to remove any queries or lack of clarity, the party gorkom [city committee] invited to Kazan a group of people who were directly involved in drawing up the draft program.

What conclusion did they reach?

First and foremost, it is necessary to accelerate the publication of the draft new program. If possible, it should be published immediately after being examined at a session of the Program Commission. As is well known, this was set up by resolution of the 28th congress. It was tasked with drawing up the draft of the future program and publishing it for discussion in the party in the first six months of 1991. I think that alongside the program document a tactical document—a draft program for the CPSU's parliamentary activity—should be submitted to the next party congress.

It is not enough just to publish the draft program. We need to ensure that the system for propagandizing it works properly. And it is important to involve all Communists to this end. No proposal should go unanswered.

We also need to be prepared for the possibility that by no means all Communists will welcome the draft program "with open arms": Not everyone will like its reforming nature. But we should not adjust ourselves to suit other people.

M.S. Gorbachev was right when he noted in his speech at a meeting with the aktiv in Alma-Ata in late May that "the new program is the basis on which the party will finally decide where it stands. And whoever rejects the program should decide for themselves what to do."

I think that all of us together will decide where we stand. Here are some lines from the minutes of the party meeting at the "Itil" Science and Production State Cooperative Association: "The meeting decided to suspend resignations and expulsions from the party pending publication of the draft CPSU program and its ratification at the supreme party forum."

No Date Set for Congress of People's Deputies

LD2706162591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] No date for convening a routine Congress of USSR People's Deputies has been set, Maslennikov, head of the press service of the country's parliament, told a TASS correspondent. The date will be set after the draft union treaty has been discussed by the supreme soviets of union republics and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputies Said Concerned About Post-Treaty Future

PM2706132991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 91 p 1

[From RIA-URAL-AKTSENT-IMA-PRESS-TASS column under "News" rubric: "We Will Hold Out Until 1993"]

[Text] Vladislav Shapovalenko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and people's deputy, believes that a section of Supreme Soviet deputies are concerned for their fate if the Union Treaty is signed. In his opinion, these deputies believe that "while the new draft Constitution is being adopted and while nationwide discussion of it is taking place they will hold out until 1993, when they face reelection anyway."

However, many deputies fear that the USSR Supreme Soviet could be dissolved immediately after the Union Treaty has been signed and that they will have to retire on pension, whereas life in the Supreme Soviet is not comfortable by today's standards, Shapovalenko thinks.

Novo-Ogarevo Process, Privatization Viewed

PM2706141291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[M. Berger article: "Friends Are Friends, But Factories Are Another Matter"]

[Text] Do we know how to make agreements? A rhetorical question, but nonetheless topical. After the appearance of the "Nine plus One" joint statement the "Novo-Ogarevo process" began, the essence of which is to establish coordinated rules and principles for relations among those who will make up the new federation and to distribute areas of competence between the center and the components of the federation, and also to define the position with regard to those republics that do not sign the Union Treaty.

But events of recent weeks, running in parallel, so to speak, with the "Novo-Ogarevo process," show that it is considerably easier to agree on particular principles than to secure their implementation.

It is envisaged that the republics forming a single economic space will offer each other most-favored status, pursue a coordinated financial policy, and so on, and so forth. At the same time one of the pillars of the Novo-Ogarevo agreements, the Ukraine, adopted a decision at the beginning of June on establishing its own jurisdiction over all enterprises and organizations under Union jurisdiction that are located on its territory. Explanations to the effect that the establishment of republic jurisdiction does not mean a change of ownership do nothing to change the nature of the problem that arises. The fact is that in an interview Ukrainian premier V. Fokin defined jurisdiction as granting to the Ukraine's organs of state administration the potential to prohibit enterprises from shipping output outside the republic.

And whereas the position of republics that are breaking away from the federation allows the discussion of questions of Union property on their territory, the Ukrainian parliament's decision is unconditional. A report by our Kiev correspondent S. Tsikora on this decision cited one point in the decision: "Legislative acts and decisions of Union organs with regard to ownership of facilities located on the republic's territory that are adopted without coordination with the highest organs of state power and administration of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] have no legal force and are not subject to implementation." This is not so much jurisdiction as "jurisdiktat."

The supporters of this decision have some highly convincing arguments. Union departments are hastily forming their enterprises into all kinds of joint-stock companies, holding onto a majority of the shares, or all of the shares, for themselves. That is to say, what is happening is what the report of the Moscow Institute of Economic Policy calls nomenklatura-bureaucratic and nomenklatura-territorial privatization. In the first case, a sector goes over to a joint-stock system or a system of concerns with no change of owner (the "Gazprom" Concern takes the place of the Ministry of the Gas Industry). In the second, associations of Union-owned enterprises are set up, which, the report says, are rather like ministries for the management of Union property on the territory of individual republics, chiefly the Baltic republics.

This turn of events, plus the example of its Novo-Ogarevo partners, is probably what prompted Kazakhstan to adopt the decision to transfer all Union enterprises to the republic's jurisdiction from 1 July.

But however cogent the arguments in favor of this means of protecting a given republic's economic interests, the question arises: What is the use of the accords reached, and can they be relied on? After all, nomenklatura privatization began long before the Novo-Ogarevo meetings (that "Gazprom" Concern did not just spring up yesterday, or even this year). We will not dwell in detail on an evaluation of such actions by the center and by Union departments; we will only note that they are "privatizing" enterprises both before the signing of the Union Treaty and before the adoption of the Law on Privatization. But in any event these actions were no secret, and that means that the participants in the Novo-Ogarevo process went into the agreement with their eyes open. So why did they not make it a condition that the dividing up of property by anyone at all would cease until the Union Treaty has been approved? Was it in order to keep their own hands free, and, by establishing their own jurisdiction over Union property, to take a tougher stance with regard to the center? And in fact, why not take "economic hostages" in this way, and demand, in exchange for their release, that the Kremlin provide the money and potential to proceed unhampered all the way to "Economic Prosperity" Station?

Joking apart, given this policy on the part of the creators of the single economic space, is it surprising that the Union prime minister asks that the Cabinet be given the right to tear up, if necessary, the contracts concluded by enterprises? After all, this too would be a kind of way of establishing Cabinet jurisdiction over all enterprises, including enterprises that are under republic jurisdiction. True, this right has thus far remained only one of the Cabinet's unfulfilled intentions, but the intentions of the center's partners in the single economic space are no more attractive. Recently the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet appointed, by a majority of votes, the chairman of the National Bank of the Ukraine. The appointment was preceded by a program speech by the candidate. It proposes, in particular, the introduction of a national currency, the creation of their own gold reserve, and the establishment of a republic monopoly over goldfields.

In this respect the policy of the republics seceding from the Union looks much more like the policy of partners. They have for a long time unequivocally declared their intention of introducing their own national currency. And they propose to structure their participation in the Union market on the basis of an economic space that is divided in this way.

Which is better, or at least more honest: To agree on a common economy but retain the right to build fences, or to agree on a fence and seek acceptable forms of cooperation?

It is beyond dispute that administrative diktat by the center, its possible reinforcement, and nomenklatura-bureaucratic privatization are unpleasant things, and the republics' desire to be freed from these things and from the other remnants of the centralized system is entirely natural and deserving of respect. But surely it would be more correct, in order to achieve the goals set, to seek to change the center's economic policy and economic relations within the new federation (given that you have agreed to form such a federation), rather than arbitrarily to change your own policy, which is, naturally, much easier.

In this case it is not a question of whether particular decisions are good or bad, right or wrong. It is a question of the ability or inability to make agreements and, most

important, to abide by the accords achieved. Unless that ability is discovered and demonstrated quite convincingly, there is no point in discussing the merits or demerits of any programs, whether from Moscow or Harvard. We simply won't need them.

Deputy Argues Against Abolition of Congress

PM2706141591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[Article by USSR People's Deputy Ed. Gams and journalist A. Kuznetsov: "Are Congresses Superfluous?"]

[Text] Talk about the "superfluity" of the Union and republic Congresses of People's Deputies is not new—it has long been a topic for radicals of various stripes. But now it has moved into the "predetermined from on high" category: It is claimed that the signing of the Union Treaty will mark the end of the "honeymoon" of the short-lived but turbulent coexistence between the congresses and the parliaments—the Supreme Soviets. Admittedly, it is hard to understand why this constitutional question was decided in a dacha near Moscow by just 10 leaders, thus bypassing thousands of people's deputies who were legally elected for a five-year term by millions of citizens. How is this compatible with the fact that the First Congress, reflecting the people's will, assumed full authority in the country?

Reviving the historical slogan "All Power to the Soviets," society set out to ensure in the supreme organ of state power the broadest representation for all the population's social strata and all nationalities and regions. The Congress is the supreme authority in the Union and the republics and for its everyday legislative work delegates some of its powers to its appointed organs—the Supreme Soviets. At any rate, during the election campaign that was how we explained to our voters the reasons for changing the previous state system. The dissolution—and early dissolution—of the Congresses of People's Deputies brings us full circle. There is no doubt that in this case (even supposing the size of the Supreme Soviet were doubled) the above-mentioned representation in the supreme organ of power would fall.

In our view, parliaments do not necessarily need to be filled with professionals—most often, lawyers, political scientists, economists, or historians. Workers and peasants (from kolkhozes and sovkhozes) are not members of this group, but who is more competent than they when it comes to anything regarding the needs and interests of citizens who are working people!

Incidentally, the need for proportional representation for various population groups was well understood by prerevolutionary parliamentarians in the Russian Empire. Supreme organs of power were created in the same way after October following the same principle—except that it was the class principle rather than the feudal estate principle.

The reform of state power enshrined by Stalin's 1936 constitution proceeded on the basis that antagonistic classes had totally disappeared from the country and that the state had become a state of all the people. We will let historians decide whether this was so or not. Let us return to the present. And we will see that antagonistic classes, including private owners, entrepreneurs, and merchants, are staging a comeback. Not to see this would be to bury your head in the sand.

Bearing this in mind, it is necessary, in our opinion, to resolve the following question: Should we have a Congress and a Supreme Soviet which it has set up and which is answerable to it, or should we have just a Supreme Soviet—a parliament of "competent people" and professionals? We are convinced that a professional parliament made up of lawyers, economists, political scientists, and cooperative members is by no means the acme of people's power. All these are, in general, professions which serve somebody. It isn't hard to guess whom they will serve in the new parliament—those who hold the levers of power. Isn't it clear that, given the appearance of private-owner classes and the renaissance of class antagonisms, direct representation for the worker and peasant masses in the soviets should be increased rather than cut back? That is why we cannot agree with the high-handed abolition (in violation of the constitution) of the Congresses of People's Deputies—they are the most tried and tested way for the broad masses to be actively involved in running the state.

One other point. The Congresses of People's Deputies are now particularly carrying out their role as a kind of "fine-tooth comb" which (how can we put it tactfully?) amends acts of legislation adopted by the Supreme Soviets in the heat of political and other arguments, and which therefore often contain various "excesses" or "distortions." We would make so bold as to claim that people's deputies carry out this function quite responsibly at their Congresses.

Role of Constitutional Oversight Viewed

PM2806085691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

["Political Diary" article by Yuriy Feofanov: "The Right to Power"]

[Text] A year has passed since the Constitutional Oversight Committee was created in our country. The anniversary was not commemorated. But it seems that in the near future we will find out whether the committee has come to be the "third power" in the state, or whether it is just another legal consultative body...

In this connection I would like to assess the events of last week. It began with the latest "shipboard mutiny" in our parliament, and ended with the president's speech on Friday. In the interim the public's agitation was fed by rumor and conjecture.

In his Friday speech the president seemed to set everything to rights. But did he?

The heated debates in parliament and public agitation were prompted by an apparently entirely democratic move by the premier—he asked the Supreme Soviet for additional powers, including legislative powers. He did not grab another piece of power, he did not move his divisions toward the center of the capital—he only appealed to parliament. A normal, democratic move—but what a reaction! That being so, it was the people's deputies themselves who wrote the tune for this "song," by extending the president's powers twice in the last year, handing over to him their own "vital" legislative prerogatives. If you can do it for the president, why should the government not have the same?

And so the Constitutional Oversight Committee's birthday should be marked by an answer to this question—it is preparing to discuss the legal validity of the USSR Supreme Soviet's delegating its legislative powers to the head of state and to the government, in fact, the delegating of powers in general.

Let us come back to the debates. Parliamentarians discussed the question of whether or not to vest legislative functions in the premier; whether to grant him these functions themselves, or to refer to the president—let him share his own powers. But unfortunately, it did not occur to the legislators to ask themselves: Do they themselves have the power to pass on what was given to them by the Congress of People's Deputies? In a rule-of-law state only parliament has the right to promulgate laws—that is the norm. More—it is the basis of democratic statehood; the unit of right, the "atom of right," that can not be broken up or split without causing the destruction of the system of legal power, or indeed exploding it. The president twice appealed to parliament for a redistribution of legislative roles. They went halfway to meet him: They gave him powers in the legislative sphere, but restricted them in space and time. Now parliament itself is saying: If the president considers it necessary, he can share his functions with the Cabinet of Ministers. But in that case it would be quite logical for the premier to share that right with the head of some department or other... Sorry, but it all begins to look like some kind of power bazaar.

In our country the spaces that fall under the jurisdiction of the three official branches of state power—legislative, executive, and judicial—are still ill-defined. But in addition, the power of the Communist Party apparatus still persists, the military-industrial complex has real power, at times power is transferred to the miners or to the "salvation committees," the mafia gets in on the act, the press also claims power. And all this is normal, it is nothing to be afraid of, provided that there exists in the country an indivisible law [pravo] that sets the limits on each power—including parliament and the president.

Unfortunately, our society, including all its structures and units up to and including parliament, is oriented not toward law, but toward persons. I remember how at the USSR Supreme Soviet session that discussed the question of introducing the post of president, there was a polemic between what I would call "cold law" and "hot nature."

From A. Sobchak's speech: "We should remember that in Russia, unfortunately, even in the Soviet period, for centuries it was not laws, but people who ruled. And today, in resolving the question of introducing presidential rule, we should move away from specific personalities and think about creating a system of state power and state rule that will work independently of who specifically holds this or that post."

From D. Kugultinov's speech: "I absolutely disagree with Comrade Sobchak. He's supposed to be so smart, he's crammed full of all the articles of all the laws, but he doesn't know much about life, he doesn't know much about what is going on now in the country. We need a president, we need a man. Even the beginning of Deputy Sobchak's speech, when he said that we should move away from people and rely solely on laws, frankly alarmed me... We have had plenty of laws, splendid laws, but not enough splendid people to implement those laws."

I am not saying who is right in this debate, but I am sure that there is no such thing as a "system... that works independently of who specifically holds this or that post." I carefully monitor the work of our Constitutional Committee and attend virtually all its sessions. No, the committee does not yield to the president's authority. But all the same, a degree of timidity can be sensed. The first presidential decree whose validity was called into question by the Constitutional Oversight Committee was the decree "On Sadovoye Koltso"—the president took the center of the capital out of Moscow City Soviet's jurisdiction and handed over to the Council of Ministers the right to permit or ban demonstrations there. Which was a gross violation of the constitution. The findings contained vague words about exceeding powers, must be brought into line with... and so forth. Not what was expected: "contrary to the Constitution... revoked." There was not the authoritative rigor which suggests the right to an authoritative ban, rather than an eye to other authorities.

Recently, in the corridors of the Constitutional Oversight Committee, I caught this remark: "Lukyanov is going to receive [Constitutional Oversight Committee Chairman] Alekseyev tomorrow." But if you take a strict view of the legal position of these officials, there can be no question of one of them "receiving" the other, there can only be a "meeting." Because Alekseyev, Gorbachev, and Lukyanov were all equally elected by the Congress of People's Deputies; it was from the Congress that the authorities they represent received their powers, each of these authorities is sovereign in its own sphere of activity, and they are dependent on one another only in the legal sense, not in any hierarchical sense.

Yes, if you like, I am quibbling over a word—"Lukyanov is going to receive Alekseyev"—maybe it was indeed a "meeting." But what lies behind this is a stereotyped way of thinking and acting. It affects everything. The residences of the president and parliament are well known—the Kremlin. Where is the Constitutional Oversight Committee's residence? Next to the Kremlin, beyond the wall, in the museum rooms. Every presidential decree, every parliamentary act is published by the whole of the official press, but the findings of the Constitutional Committee are not published in full even in IZVESTIYA. The committee has declared invalid, from 1 March this year, all unpublished enactments of government or of departments, if they affect human rights. To this day I am puzzled as to why the press has not subjected the fulfillment of this act to constant vigilance—after all, there are thousands of resolutions and directives that concern every one of us, and I am sure new ones are springing up.

All the same, neither premises or other surroundings, nor the press will give our constitutional court the prestige necessary for a rule-of-law regime, unless it declares itself authoritatively and imperiously.

The chairman of France's Constitutional Council once said in an interview with an IZVESTIYA correspondent: "The main purpose of constitutional oversight is that it makes it possible to approach the resolution of political problems by legal means." True, the Constitutional Oversight Committee should, through its findings, indicate the legal means by which politics can achieve its goals. But if politics does not want to adjust its path according to the law, then the law must fling itself across the rails. Risky, you may say. Because the object of the aspirations of politics and politicians is primarily power, and they often advance toward it at headlong speed.

The Constitutional Oversight Committee greeted its second year by preparing to examine the problems of the delegation of power by those who are not entitled to redistribute the said power. It must be said clearly: The powers are permitted to do only what is directly prescribed by law, and no more than that. The formula "everything that is not banned, is permitted" does not apply to the powers. It is exclusively the privilege of citizens.

It would be good if the law would support a policy of state significance, without giving way before the onslaught of tyranny "in the name of state interests."

Gorbachev Meets Moscow Patriarch Aleksey II

LD2706180891 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev met Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia Aleksey II in the Kremlin today.

Gorbachev and Aleksey stressed the importance of public accord in resolving current difficulties and promoting moral values.

Completion of Oil Deal With Chevron Doubted

OW2806102491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From "Diplomatic panorama"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to a high-ranking Western diplomat, American companies are prepared to invest from 8 to 10 billion dollars into the oil fields in the Barents Sea. Another 6 or 8 million could be invested into oil extraction under the Sakhalin island. As to the agreement on working the Tenghiz oil field in Kazakhstan signed by the Chevron corporation, the diplomat fears that the reports in the Soviet press were touched with incompetence.

If Chevron's returns in that project are 16 percent, that casts no doubt on the agreement. In Nigeria, for instance, American corporations draw up to 25 percent. But Chevron is running a high risk by investing large sums in Soviet industry.

At the Soviet Foreign Ministry they confirmed in principle Soviet interest in cooperating with the United States in oil production. They declined to comment, though, on Chevron's plans in Kazakhstan leaving it to experts to assess the economic advantages of this or that agreement. But there is information that Kazakhstan's President Nursultan Nazarbayev has suspended the Tenghiz project.

KGB Staffer Responds to Query on Bodyguards

PM2706151591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 p 1

["KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA News Service" feature comprising letter from KGB Staffer V. Aleynikov, followed by Editorial Office comment: "KGB to Politkovskiy"]

[Text] The KGB always responds with great attentiveness and keenness to appeals and suggestions made by citizens and to reports in the mass media, especially when they aim to further improve our activity.

Bearing this in mind, we are grateful to you, Shura Politkovskiy, for discovering a KGB protection detail where it does not exist and, as professional television journalist, for not noticing one where it is much in evidence but is not made up of KGB staffers.

I do not want to compete with the tone of the open letter to USSR KGB Chairman Comrade V.A. Kryuchkov nor with the ambiguities it contains. However, it seems to us that your letter, in both form and content, certainly does no credit to such a popular journalist.

Nevertheless, we should explain yet again in simple terms, and this includes explaining it to you, Shura, that the USSR KGB Protection Service provides protection for the highest state leadership, top-level foreign state and public figures visiting our country, and the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congresses of People's Deputies and other state and public events.

We have received quite a few urgent warnings, including reported threats of physical reprisals, directed against USSR people's deputies including L.P. Kravchenko, chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Company.

Regarding the dozens of "bodyguards" attached to the chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Company, somebody has deliberately led you astray.

And lastly, Shura, should you of course require "bodyguards" as a result of the difficulties involved in carrying out your official and deputy's duties (frenzied attacks by female fans, admirers, rivals in entrepreneurial television activity, and so on), we would be able to provide protection—chargeable, of course, to your deputy's expense account, as the saying goes (and without your having to sound a warning).

On behalf of the USSR KGB Protection Service Staffers

[Signed] V. Aleynikov.

From The Editorial Office

Although he refused to compete with "the tone of the open letter to USSR KGB Chairman Comrade V.A. Kryuchkov or the ambiguities it contains," Comrade V. Aleynikov has nevertheless not gone much further than this sort of contest. Despite the fact that he was acting on behalf of KGB Protection Service staffers, Comrade V. Aleynikov has simply failed to answer the questions raised in the letter written by RSFSR People's Deputy A. Politkovskiy.

1. On the basis of what reasons of state does the USSR KGB provide protection for various people?

2. How much does it cost taxpayers to provide "bodyguards" for state officials?

And a final point: A. Politkovskiy's letter was addressed to Comrade V.A. Kryuchkov, and if the chairman of the USSR KGB considered it beneath his dignity to reply to it, then Comrade Aleynikov should have indicated his position or rank to allow the public to identify the USSR KGB position that corresponds to that of RSFSR people's deputy and member of the Committee for Human Rights.

[Signed] KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA News Service

P.S. The text of Comrade Aleynikov's letter has been printed without corrections and with minor cuts.

Poll Shows Mixed Feelings About Patriotic War

OW2806075391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From "Viewpoint"; Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] An opinion poll carried out by the national Public Opinion Studies Center (VCIOM) on June 8-18 contained several questions about the Great Patriotic War which broke out on Jun 22 fifty years ago. The poll involved 2,061 people making up a representative cross-section of the USSR's population, reports the news agency DATA.

Asked "Do you think we know the whole truth about the Great Patriotic War?", 60 percent of the respondents said NO, and 18 percent said YES.

14 percent expressed no definite opinion on the matter.

The question "do you still feel hostility toward the Germans?" produced negative replies in 80 percent of cases. The rest (20 percent) of the respondents replied in the affirmative.

The statistical error margin was set at 3 percent.

TASS Review 28 Jun Press

LD2806065191 Moscow TASS in English 0614 GMT 28 Jun 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Today's central newspapers report that a meeting of the Defence Council to the president of the USSR was held in the Kremlin on Thursday under the chairmanship of Mikhail Gorbachev.

The council considered some matters concerning the defence policy in the light of the realisation of the new defensive military doctrine and the carrying out of reforms in the Soviet Armed Forces and keeping troops and naval forces in constant combat readiness.

Special attention was drawn to arrangements for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern European countries and Mongolia and the provision of amenities at new places of the stationing of troops. Problems of providing the families of servicemen with housing and their social protection were discussed in detail.

PRAVDA reports that Gorbachev met with Patriarch Aleksey II of Moscow and all Russia in the Kremlin on Thursday.

They discussed matters that are equally of concern to believers and non-believers. The president and the patriarch emphasised an immense importance of social accord for overcoming the difficulties of the transitional period and for reviving spirituality and ethics.

PRAVDA runs the text of President Gorbachev's message of greetings to a congress of the international physicians for the prevention of nuclear war (IPPNW). The congress opened in Stockholm on Thursday.

"From the very outset, the Soviet Union has been sharing your movement's ideas. We highly appreciate the IPPNW's contribution to cultivating new, humanistic thinking," the message points out in particular.

The message expresses the Soviet Union's readiness to continue "to work persistently for accords on a total ban on nuclear tests."

Newspapers carry the text of the USSR president's decree on changing a procedure for the utilisation of the currency resources of businesses, organisations and amalgamations of the agroindustrial sector in 1991. The decree has been published with a view to creating favourable conditions for the development of the material and technical basis of agroindustrial-sector enterprises and a boost to the output of agricultural produce and food.

The decree establishes that the amount of currency revenue from the export of products (work or services), subject to compulsory sale to the USSR bank for foreign economic activities by agroindustrial-sector enterprises is reduced by the sum of their currency expenditure for the purchase abroad of technologies, farm machinery, technological equipment for the storage and processing of farm produce, spare parts for equipment, seeds of crops, pedigree agricultural animals, agricultural chemicals, veterinary drugs, equipment for the production of building materials and structural elements.

PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA report that the secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, at its meeting on Thursday, expressed concern over the weakening of the party positions among the working-class environment and suggested that a plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee be held to discuss the problem.

Participants in the secretariat's meeting, which was presided over by Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, analysed the situation in the working-class movement of the USSR. They emphasised the need for immediate, energetic actions to restore and strengthen the party positions among the working-class environment.

The secretariat prepared a document determining the tasks of party organisations in the working-class movement.

Reporting proceedings of the Russian federation parliament on Thursday, the press notes that the parliament devoted much time to the discussion of amendments to the law on a constitutional court of the Russian Federation. A record number of amendments—180—were offered for the consideration of the republican parliament members. An overwhelming majority of the amendments were turned down.

A law, adopted for the first time in Russian legislation on May 6, this year, establishes a constitutional court which, in keeping with the principles of the separation of powers into judicial, executive and legislative branches, should exercise control over the conformity of the Russian Federation laws to the Constitution. The authors of the document believe that such control will be the most "impartial and independent" (there is no such body in the federal legislation. Its functions are performed by a committee for constitutional compliance).

Reasons why a majority of amendments to the Russian law were turned down are that they, as members of parliament noted, were aimed at "eliminating the principle of the unchanginess of members of the constitutional court and at lowering the level of their financial security as a major guarantee of their independence."

Having completed work on a package of amendments, members of the Russian parliament failed to adopt an appropriate resolution on bringing into effect a new edition of the law and postponed the issue to the next meeting.

The republican parliament endorsed a law "on the assumption of office by the president of the Russian Federation (Boris Yeltsin is known to have been elected to the post as a result of the June 12 elections).

Under the law, the president assumes office not later than within one month of the official announcement of election results. The day of the swearing-in of the republic's president is viewed as the day of his assumption of office.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper carries an interview in which Aleksandr Yakovlev, senior adviser to the president of the USSR, refuted rumours that he intends to discard his Communist Party membership and found a new party.

Yakovlev, who is now in hospital, told the newspaper's correspondent Anatoliy Yurkov that it is "those who push the party towards a break-up and try to revive the spirit and ways of bygone days" want to portray him as a "splitter."

Yakovlev said that he sent an appropriate statement to Soviet newspapers that published allegations on that score.

Today's PRAVDA runs a document, endorsed earlier by the secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee—"A Mechanism for the Formation, Fulfilment and Control Over the Budget of the CPSU."

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries an interview with Valentin Sychev, secretary of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), who, on the eve of the CMEA's "farewell" session symbolising the end of this international organisation, comments on the results of its years-long activities and on the causes that led to its disbandment, and prospects for further cooperation among former CMEA member-states.

There is an article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA marking the 70th jubilee of the Communist Party of China and its leading role in the life of Chinese society.

A PRAVDA commentary, dealing with the results of Cambodia's Supreme National Council meeting held in the Thai city of Phatthaya, points out that, unlike previous meetings, this round of the talks led to results that may become a realistic basis for headway in resolving one of acute conflicts on the Asian continent.

Economic

Gorbachev Issues Decree on Currency Resources

LD2706172491 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR president today issued a decree on the alteration of the procedure for the use of hard currency resources by enterprises, organizations and associations of the agro- industrial complex in 1991. The decree states that the level of hard currency earnings of enterprises of the agro-industrial complex from the export of goods, subject to obligatory sale to the USSR Foreign Economic Activity Bank for repayment of the USSR's foreign debt, is to be reduced by a sum amounting to their hard currency spending on the purchase abroad of technology, hardware and equipment for the storage and processing of agricultural output. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has been instructed to ensure implementation of the present decree and to put it into effect from the moment of promulgation. The USSR president's decree is being published in full in the press.

'Victimized' Miners on Underground Hunger Strike

PM2806084991 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Jun 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast: Report by L. Shesterkina]

[Text] [Shesterkina] Last Monday miners at the "Tsentralnaya" mine of the Severokarabashskiy ore-mining enterprise in Chelyabinsk Oblast declared an underground hunger strike to protest against a decision to close down the mine.

The conflict arose because the Karabash copper-smelting combine, whose debts total 11 million rubles [R], shut down a number of unprofitable production units. Having invested R7 million in a new seam, the miners were hoping to be able to enter the market by the end of this year as a profit-making and economically clean enterprise on the basis of new accounting prices and promised subsidies. Naturally, no one needs loss-making enterprises at the moment. However, the Copper Industry Institute reckons that the local ore reserves are sufficient for another ten years or more, especially since the country badly needs the metal. The miners believe that they are being victimized because they were among the first to demand a reorganization of the copper-smelting combine to improve the ecological situation in Karabash city.

Background to Commodities Exchange Scandal Cited

PM2706134391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[M. Krushinskiy article: "Commodities Exchange After Investigation"]

[Text] Having survived a difficult period, the Moscow Commodities Exchange, the pioneer of our commodities exchange movement, seems to have gotten its second wind. The general meeting of members has approved its new rules, which state that the limited liability company is to be transformed into a voluntary association of legal persons and citizens with the consequent greater structural flexibility. The Moscow Commodities Exchange's declared incorporation capital is increased fivefold—from 20 million rubles [R] to R100 million. In addition, by not electing G. Poleshchuk, former cochairman of the exchange committee, to the management organs, the exchange's members seem to have tacitly acknowledged the foolishness of his attempts, much publicized in the press, to seize power by using outlandish strong-arm methods.

I do not want to drag that story up again. But it is at least possible now to talk about it without the risk of being accused of personal bias, because documents exist to show that the comprehensive audit of the Moscow Commodities Exchange's economic and financial activity initiated by the exchange committee is now complete. Specialists from the independent auditing firm "Kontakt" pointed out several yawning gaps in the exchange's financial documentation, thereby confirming that the claims against the former leader by the Moscow Commodities Exchange leadership were by no means without foundation.

Until recently there were two cochairmen of the exchange committee, but their functions diverged significantly. G. Poleshchuk was in charge of the expenditure of resources in the Moscow Commodities Exchange current account and was responsible for questions of financial planning. Thus the absence at the exchange of anything resembling a general estimate of expenditure, the muddle over capital costs, and disorder in bookkeeping are typical primarily of his professional activity. The most distressing thing, however, is that it is not simply a matter of a lack of the meticulousness which is so essential in money matters. Within that disorder one senses a certain order whose purpose is as far as possible to remove the financial operations of the "first signatory" from the control of his colleagues.

Suppose the exchange receives a credit for 17,000 foreign currency rubles to cover expenses connected with a trip by several of its staff to the United States, but this

substantial amount of money surprisingly does not feature in the books of the Moscow Commodities Exchange. G. Poleshchuk (need one add that he is a member of the delegation and even ventures to stay abroad on business beyond the scheduled date?) is in control of these dollars and has not accounted to anyone for them, and furthermore it transpires from the audit document that there still is no account. What does Poleshchuk himself say in explanation of this potentially criminal muddle? His reply to my question was evasive: I do not want to account "to those people"! What have his commodities exchange committee colleagues done to offend him so much?

Here is a document which sheds some light on the history and character of mutual relations in the exchange's leading body: It consists of extracts from the minutes of its sessions from November 1990. Or to be more precise—a list of urgent demands to the cochairman; Present an estimate of expenditure, draft a financial plan, report on the sale of seats at the exchange on a commercial basis, clarify the structure of officials, prepare a new version of the contract with the foreign partner.... There were dozens of these "requests" (some repeated over and over) but on the right-hand side the note: "not done... not prepared... not submitted...." Presumably these people seemed to him to be a group of tiresome and crusty old bores. And he continued to decide for himself where to invest money belonging to the exchange and on what terms, what office equipment to buy and why, and which foreigners to develop contacts with and in what form.

The growing mutual enmity between the members and cochairman of the exchange committee was resolved, as is well known, by the scandal of 22 May. On that day the Soviet-Yugoslav joint venture "Voltek" (a founder of the Moscow Commodities Exchange) which had previously nominated G. Poleshchuk to the committee, stated that it was relieving him of those powers. Strictly speaking, the former leader, having lost his "mandate," became a "nobody" at the exchange but refused to accept that fact.

Subsequent events are like a parody of a cheap hit movie: the violent seizure by the deposed leader of the appurtenances of power—the Moscow Commodities Exchange seal—the publication of a political manifesto, that is, an order to the exchange that all G. Poleshchuk's proclamations are law and vice versa, and even the imposition of a "curfew" using detectives from the "Aleks" detective agency armed with air guns (it would be interesting to know who paid for this—after all, this form of amusement is far from cheap!). Many people know from lurid publications in other newspapers about the absurd attempt at an "apparatus coup" at the Moscow Commodities Exchange, including the convening of a "constituent meeting" of people amenable to the would-be dictator. I am not going to try to outdo them. I would rather talk about something known to only a few: why, in fact, the "Voltek" joint venture decided to ditch Poleshchuk from the exchange committee.

The fact is that it was in May that his intrigues as general director of "Voltek" from the previous November came to light. In fact, he filled two positions at that time—one as chief of the joint venture, the other as a bigwig at the exchange, which situation he decided to try to exploit. On the sly, exceeding his powers, Poleshchuk—as chief of the joint venture—invested the company's money in setting up a brokerage firm, after which Poleshchuk—now as head of the exchange administration—tried to sell Moscow Commodities Exchange seats to his covert partners on the cheap.

It was at this point, admittedly, that they almost caught him. In one sense they actually did: The operation was too obviously contrary to the exchange's interests. They began to investigate—and found out how Poleshchuk had abused his official position at "Voltek." This time, however, he got himself out of a jam by vowing to friends and colleagues that what had happened was a complete misunderstanding. They believed him. It wasn't until three months later that the original contract on the creation of that brokerage firm (I have a copy before me) came into their hands: This document shows that G. Poleshchuk made free not only with company money but with his own money too, when he became cofounder and coowner of the enterprise which he patronized as a member of the exchange.

By and large then, it is a scandalous story with criminal overtones. How far will it help to answer the question which, to slightly paraphrase a certain arch rhyme, runs: "What kind of stockbroker is he, arriving on an armored car?" In other words, why did he need this whole farce with the armed seizure of the management offices at the Moscow Commodities Exchange? The point, I think, lies not just in our hero's militant character. Nor is it just his desire to keep his job come what may. Among other things, he was motivated by a fear of public disclosure and wanted to quell that fear by piling one absurdity on top of another.

But since the discussion has turned to the psychological reasons for what happened, it is necessary to broach the riddle of his long-suffering friends and colleagues. Indeed, why for almost half a year did they allow themselves to be led on by a man whom they themselves had appointed to lead the apparatus, why did they watch impassively as he used the potential of that apparatus little by little to strengthen his position—not in the exchange committee but at "grassroots-level," among people who depended on him in one way or another. I fear that my explanation may seem facile but their is no alternative: The gist of the matter is that we are dealing not simply with business partners but "comrades and colleagues."

After all, he entered their midst not from the shadow economy but from the Novosibirsk Akademgorodok. I well remember the time when there were no stock exchanges but a cozy group of energetic and ambitious like-minded people burning with a desire to use the opportunities provided by the reform for the general

good, as it were. The development of horizontal links, the campaign against the growing shortages, the "white market...." Then it all acquired the "features of the stock market." Is it any wonder that the entire "team" which designed our first commodities market entered its leading body and that each of them regarded any of "his own" people with exaggerated respect?

Thank heavens at least that it all worked out relatively peacefully, and that their common brainchild—the exchange—has survived. The consequences of short-sighted group trustfulness, as history teaches us, are far more tragic.

In the incident at the Moscow Commodities Exchange I personally hear a warning bell tolling the early demise of the romantic stage in the development of our business life. The time of "illustrious cohorts," scandalous adventures, and fortunes made "overnight" is passing. What is approaching instead is the era of the severe prose of mutual relations between the business and material world with its dry, precise "material" language. And the sooner we learn that language the fewer bankruptcies we can expect.

Meanwhile the Moscow Commodities Exchange has announced a competition to fill the vacant post of president. This honorary title is being introduced under the new rules of the stock market: G. Poleshchuk was not president although he liked to call himself that. The results of the competition are expected to be announced in July.

Ministers Debate Privatization Process

914A0886A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 25 Jun 91 p 2

[Article by Lyudmila Biryukova: "Timely Topic: How to Reconcile a Snake and a Hedgehog. Notes From the Meeting of the Country's Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] Finally.... It seems possible to move on from discussions of the need for economic reform to real work in the next few days. As soon as the USSR Supreme Soviet adopts the law on state withdrawal and privatization, a large-scale plowing under of the foundations of our economic system will begin.

In society there are still discussions about how we are to make this abrupt change and even about whether we should do it at all. But the majority have already come to understand that there is no point in waiting until these discussions end. A lot of time has already been lost. "Well, why argue," writes K. Bessonov, a lathe operator at the Vladimir Tractor Plant, in his letter to the editor. "Let everyone listen to his own feelings and they will understand that our desire to have some kind of property in our hands and to multiply it by our labor was instilled in us by nature. Enough, we do not want to be pilferers any longer. We want to be owners and co-owners of our enterprises and the fruits of our labor."

The editorial mail includes many letters like this, which shows that there has been a psychological breakthrough in society and among the workers. This is also being taken into account by our legislators and the country's Cabinet of Ministers, which a couple of days ago discussed the main provisions of the draft law on state withdrawal and privatization and also the mechanism for putting it into effect. Since the leaders of the governments of the Union republics were in attendance, this question immediately arose: How are we to begin to distribute the property if the state-owner has so many unclear points regarding dividing the property up with the sovereign republics? The chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Ukraine, I. Silayev and V. Fokin, and many of their colleagues as well insisted: First it is necessary to determine the fate of Union property on the territory of the republic.

"We, for example, had to find out from the press," says I. Silayev, "that AvtoVAZ is being transformed into a joint-stock company and that 40 percent of the shares will be turned over to Italians. Nobody asked the opinion of the Russian government about this, even though VAZ is located on the territory of our federation. Is this right?"

The chairman of the country's state property fund, S. Assekritov, complained that every once in a while he gets official papers with the signatures of I. Silayev's deputies asking that one or another enterprise, association, coal mine, or floating base be transferred to the jurisdiction of Russia, "by a decision of the labor collectives." But the fund does not have the right to sign these documents since it is an executive organ. Moreover, as participants in the discussion explained, transfer to the republic's jurisdiction certainly does not mean that the property will be placed in the republic's possession. This act merely gives it the right to control Union-wide property."

"There is no reason to delay formation of a market mechanism or wait until we have things straightened out with the section on Union property," noted Prime Minister V. Pavlov at this time.

Actually, the process of radical transformations must proceed from below. It is the labor collectives that should choose their own fate and determine the forms and procedure for state withdrawal or privatization. And it is not so important what name they give to all this. The main goal is a free commodity producer.

The draft law envisions transfer of property both with and without reimbursement. The prime minister was categorically against this point:

"There will be no transfers without payment! It is possible to sell property under privileged conditions but not to give it away."

There was no discussion of this. Nobody objected and nobody supported him. The cabinet was silent and it agreed with the viewpoint of its head apparently with indifference. And that is a pity. The question is far from indisputable. If there had been a single worker in the hall, even the lathe operator Bessonov from Vladimir, he would have explained to the high-level meeting that he had been working for many years with an old lathe, that through his labor he had bought it long ago and paid for it many times over. He would have said that, like the majority of people in his shop, he had not managed to save anything up and therefore he had nothing with which to pay for the plant. If they all want to become collective property owners together, they will have to take out credit from the bank. And that is another kind of bondage! It will take a considerable share of the profit to pay off the debt and this means that there will be nothing left to pay for retooling production.

It is known that Margaret Thatcher transformed the ailing British economy by withdrawing the state from property ownership. But the enterprises that were prepared for privatization were first technically retooled at state expense and only after that were they sold to private owners. There is no need to prove whose policy is more far-sighted and will provide for progress and the ability of production to compete.

Our prime minister held a very rigid position in the question of evaluating the state property that is sold. He thinks that it is necessary not only to collect from the new owners but to collect as much as possible, a maximum. The speaker, the chairman of the state property fund, S. Assekritov, referred here to the fact that our pricing methods are imperfect and that we have never seriously assessed anything and therefore we have certain difficulties in this matter.

V.S. Pavlov: "So will it still be we who assess the value of the machine tools or their income? Sometimes old, worn-out equipment brings immense profit by producing consumer goods."

The speaker responded meekly that the value of the fixed capital would be based on market criteria that take into account the income and the degree of risk, and toward the end he admitted that the methods of assessment had not been prepared yet. The people have a simple way of putting this: If you want to go hunting you have to feed the dogs. State withdrawal from ownership has already begun in many branches, joint-stock companies and collective enterprises are being created, and the government is still developing methodological provisions for assessing state property. Such chronic delay could lead to great conflicts. Even without this it is difficult during the course of this kind of breakdown to reconcile the interests of a hedgehog and a snake (to use the words of Prime Minister Pavlov), not to mention the interests of the state, on the one hand, and the labor collective or other owner, on the other.

Life has a habit of taking its own course. Time dictates to society the rates of development. And our immense state apparatus is remaining true to itself: It creaks as it turns while energetic movements and rapid decisions are required of it. It is not yet clear what we are to do with enterprises that are operating at a loss and how we are to provide for equal rights of citizens to obtain their share of the property. In a word, so far there is more that is clear than is unclear.

During the meeting the prime minister repeatedly emphasized that he "parted company with the country's Supreme Soviet regarding individual articles of the law." Parting company with the parliament is something which can be rectified. The main thing both for the Supreme Soviet and for the Cabinet of Ministers is how not the part company with life and with the people.

Agricultural

Weather, Crops Report for 10-20 Jun Published

PM2706155591 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Jun 91 p 2

[Agrometeorologist N. Korenkova report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Crop growth conditions during the second 10-day period of June in the country's European part were mainly favorable. However, heavy downpours in the Baltic region, in part of the territory of Belorussia and the northwest region, in the northern half of the Central region, and also in places in the Ukraine's western oblasts, caused overwetting of the soil and created complications for feed procurement and crop management. The areas of lodged tracts increased, and in places plants were damaged by diseases and pests. The temperature finally dropped in the Urals region, and it rained in the northern part. In a number of southern regions precipitation was slight, and moisture supply for crops remained insufficient.

Winter crops have flowered, and have eared in the north east. In Moldova, southeast Ukraine, the Volga region (south of Saratov), and in the greater part of the Urals region milky ripeness has started, and in the east of the North Caucasus region and in places in south Ukraine a high level of ripeness in wheat has been noted. Barley has ripened in most of the North Caucasus region's territory and in Astrakhan Oblast. The development of winter crops has exceeded the long-term annual averages by 5-10 days.

Stalk growth has been observed in early spring grain crops north of the line between Brest, Kursk, Kaluga, Yoshkar-Ola, and Samara. In the more southerly regions they have eared and flowered. South of the line between

Kirovograd, Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk, and Volgograd the milky ripeness phase has been noted in spring barley. The development of early spring grain crops in most of the USSR's European territory has taken place within times approaching the long-term annual averages, and 6-10 days earlier than them in the Central, Volga-Vyatka, and Urals regions. Crop growth conditions for early spring grain crops were mainly favorable, and the condition of crops is better and satisfactory.

Over most of the territory where grain corn is grown, conditions for it have considerably improved as a result of an increase in the air temperature. True, in the Ukraine's western oblasts the shortage of warmth persists, and plant development is lagging behind the long-term annual average times. As regards silage corn, seven leaves have formed on it. Corn growth has proceeded slowly only in north Belorussia, the Baltic region, and the south of the northwest region, where cool rainy weather has persisted.

In the beet-sowing zone, warm weather with rains has helped root growth and intensive growth of the vegetative mass. In Moldova, North Caucasus, and southern and central Ukrainian oblasts the closing [zakrytiye] of plants in spaces between rows has been noted. In Belorussia, in Tula, Nizhniy Novgorod, and Penza Oblasts, and in Tatariya the third pair of real leaves has formed on sugar beet.

In the agricultural regions of West Siberia and Kazakhstan's northern oblasts the air temperature dropped substantially in the second half of the 10-day period and it rained. Winter grain crops flowered, and in the south of Omsk Oblast and Altay Kray milky ripeness has started in them. Their development exceeds the long-term annual averages by 1.5-2 weeks. Tillering and stalk growth have been observed in early spring grain crops.

In the Central Asian republics and in south Kazakhstan unsettled weather has prevailed. In most regions budding is being noted in the cotton plant, and in resown areas development of the third-fifth leaf has been observed, which is 5-10 days (15 days in the north of the region) later than the long-term annual averages. The cotton plant started to blossom in early crops at the end of the 10-day period.

Army Prepares To Help in Volga Grain Harvest

PM2706102391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent B. Belyakov report: "Before Going Out Into the Field"]

[Text] Volga-Urals Military District—A district rally with the participation of commanders and rear services specialists has been held to discuss questions of preparing "grain battalions" for bringing in the harvest.

Specialists estimate that plenty of extra equipment and people will be needed this summer to transport the grain. Oblast leaders in the Volga area have asked the district command to help the countryside. The formation of six motorized battalions is now coming to an end. The troops are preparing to conduct the harvest campaign in an organized fashion, with total efficiency.

Shortages May Jeopardize Stavropol Kray Harvest

PM2706144391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by Gennadiy Klimov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] According to our information, the harvest has already begun in Stavropol Kray and, according to specialists, it will not be inferior to last year's.

And here is a report by our correspondent Gennadiy Klimov.

[Klimov] This is the crop which has been grown this year on the "Pershe Travnyavyy" sovkhoz [state farm] in Dnepropetrovskiy Rayon.

[Turning to farm official] What sort of yields are you expecting to achieve?

[N.P. Boyarchuk, sovkhoz director, identified by caption] We are hoping to harvest approximately 50 quintals per hectare.

[Klimov] The main point is for these expectations to come true. We know only too well that it is often difficult to harvest what has been grown. How are you preparing for the harvest this year?

[Boyarchuk] You are right, there will again be major difficulties with the harvest this year. And many of the reasons have nothing to do with us, with our machine operators, with our people. The main question today is the supply of spare parts for the combine harvesters which are to harvest this big grain crop.

[Klimov] Yet it is the simplest things which are sometimes lacking—cogs or cables—for the combine harvesters to be functional. If one machine drops out it means that an additional 150 hectares have to be harvested by the other combine harvesters, including this new "Don."

Because of lack of components, one in four combine harvesters in the Ukraine cannot take part in the harvest.

The director of the "Pershe Travnyavyy" sovkhoz is thinking about buying a U.S. combine harvester so as not to have to look for spare parts. This is quite realistic. On the eve of the harvest the sovkhoz has received the balance for last year's above-plan grain sold for hard currency. It totals $91,000.

The farm could also do with importing a small turn-key brick works, so as to be able to build housing according to what it can afford, rather than having to depend on

scarce material resources. In general, it is still necessary to learn how to spend the hard currency. And another point. Why not increase the sovkhoz's earnings of foreign currency this year? The crop, as you can see, makes this feasible.

Metal Shortage Hampers Harvest Preparations

PM2706111391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[Ye. Grigoryev article: "Peasants Marginalized Again?"]

[Text] We have more or less coped with the spring sowing. But, as they say, there's no time to catch your breath. The harvest season is coming. Is everything prepared for it, will there be a repetition of last season, when around one-third of what was grown disappeared without trace in the blind alleys and labyrinths of our mismanagement? The statistics and information coming in from local level are not reassuring. This year our crop farmers have considerably fewer grain and feed harvesting combines, tractor mowers, pickup balers, stackers, and other equipment. And a huge amount of that equipment has not yet been repaired owing to disrupted deliveries of spare parts.

It has not so far been possible, despite the government's efforts, to noticeably improve fuel supplies to the countryside. The situation remains serious. Farms have been given very meager quotas, and even these are not being supplied in full. There is not enough gasoline to successfully carry out the harvesting and haymaking or to use aircraft to spray for weeds and bugs. And fuel supplies are falling rather than increasing as the harvest approaches.

Can this situation be rectified and turned around? Or is it a bad tradition of ours to provide material supplies to the countryside as an afterthought, on the leftover principle?

This question, as already reported, was discussed at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for the Party's Agrarian Policy. The session was chaired by Ye.S. Stroyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. I. Grintsov, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; Yu. Peskov and L. Loginov, general directors of the "Rostselmash" and "Krasnoyarskiy Kombaynovyy Zavod" Production Associations; L. Khitrun, V. Donskikh, and Ye. Podolskiy, first secretaries of Ryazan, Lipetsk, and Tambov obkoms [oblast party committees]; V. Kryazhkov, vice president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences; A. Reznik, chairman of the "Mir" Kolkhoz [collective farm] in Kirovograd Oblast; V. Shurchanov, first secretary of the Chuvash RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Republic Committee; V. Starodubtsev, chairman of the USSR Peasants Union, and others expressed great concern at the now-established practice of the economic infringement of the countryside.

The discussion about the difficult position of the countryside was continued at the second stage of the USSR Peasants Union Constituent Congress. It was noted that the countryside cannot go on living the way it does at present. The existing tax system, the violation of price parity, and the discrimination in the countryside's material and technical supply will lead to many farms going bankrupt before the year is out. Peasants have again found themselves marginalized and unprotected against the arbitrary behavior and monopoly control of suppliers.

As has already occurred on a number of occasions, things are complicated by complacency and the hope that the land will sort everything out. If the worst comes to the worst, it will provide some protection. According to the reports from a number of ministries and departments everything today seems to be normal. There is enough fuel, and the plans for equipment supplies are being carried out. But the failure to supply tractors, trucks, polyethylene film, and industrial rubber and other goods is an alarming fact.

To be fair, it should be admitted that it is not out of malice that the country people's partners—agricultural machine building enterprises—are letting the crop farmers down. The Ministry of Metallurgy has restricted shipments of raw materials. Thousands of collectives have even had to take mass leave. Metal has become the countryside's Achilles heel. Strange as it may seem, people rely on it and the efforts to strengthen the rural economy and improve the population's food supply are focused on it. If there were enough metal, both the flagships of agricultural machine building and small enterprises would be operating at full capacity.

Despite the wave of economic problems and strikes, there is metal in the country. It is going abroad, at a time when we ourselves are most in need of it. Perhaps, for the sake of the harvest, it would not go amiss to distribute it in favor of the countryside. Grain is more important than tanks and foreign exchange—which, incidentally, we have been spending on buying foreign grain.

Last year graphically demonstrated that we cannot leave the countryside to cope with the harvest on its own. That would cost the entire country dear. More than 1 million vehicles and a large number of workers from enterprises and organizations, as well as student detachments, will be taking part in the harvest. Machine building enterprises will help to overhaul kolkhoz and sovkhoz equipment. Patronage—the target for so many critical barbs—is not parasitism or a whim. It is still an unfortunate necessity. The fact that such help should not come free is another matter. The government has drawn up measures to provide better incentives for the workers involved. In particular, payment in kind will be used.

Peasants today need all-around support.

Military

Defense Council Discusses Armed Forces Problems

LD2706181991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1730 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] A sitting of the Defense Council under the USSR president took place in the Kremlin today, chaired by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Several issues of defense organization were examined in the light of the implementation of the new, defensive, military doctrine and of the execution of the reform of the USSR Armed Forces. Several matters concerning the maintenance of troops and naval forces in permanent combat readiness were also considered. Particular attention was paid to organizing the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East European countries and Mongolia and to providing facilities for them in their new stations. There was a thorough discussion of the problems of providing housing for servicemen's families and insuring their social protection.

USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and ministries and departments appropriate instructions on the matters discussed.

Paper on Moiseyev Remarks to Staff Academy

PM2706102191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS correspondent O. Moskovskiy report: "Meeting With Academy Graduates"]

[Text] Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, spoke at a traditional meeting with graduates of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy. Conveying congratulations from USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, he noted that the complexity of the current situation resides in the fact that the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the elimination of the system of collective security presuppose organizing the country's defense solely within the USSR's national borders in the future. All this renders military cadres particularly responsible for keeping the troops (forces), organs of management, and staffs under their command in a state of permanent combat readiness.

It is the academy's 1991 graduates, the chief of the General Staff pointed out, who are to continue and complete by the year 2000 the reform of the Armed Forces and impart to these forces a new complexion and quality. Today they are no longer what they were two years ago. Their composition, structure, and tasks are changing. One of the main tasks facing the academy's graduates is to understand and investigate everything that is going on within the Armed Forces, in every district, army, division, and regiment. The USSR Armed Forces are still united and indivisible. Officer cadres—devoted to their chosen profession, true to military duty and fellowship, and ready to defend their socialist fatherland—form the foundation and backbone of these forces.

Army Communists on Socialist Choice, Ideology

PM2706140191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Colonel V. Iliyevskiy report: "Ideological Guidelines: Quest, Action"]

[Text] One manifestation of the active process of Communist Party renewal is the creation of a unified autonomous party organization for the USSR Armed Forces as a component of the CPSU. It numbers more than a million Communists.

A a "discussion forum" on the subject of "Marxism-Leninism and the CPSU's Present-Day Activity" was held a few days ago on the initiative of the All-Army Party Committee.

The dynamism and depth of the changes taking place in our society and in people's awareness, and the qualitatively new conditions of political struggle, require a creative approach from Communists toward the classic theoretical legacy and the rejection of entrenched stereotypes.

Under present-day conditions, we need to work out ideological guidelines and the qualities of party political fighter inherent in each Communist. Critical analysis of the practice of socialist building in our country and the East European states objectively shows the presence of major crisis phenomena on the one hand, while on the other hand it reaffirms the need for new theoretical quest taking account both of the past and of the new political realities.

The need to persistently struggle against administrative and political diktat over theory, to eliminate the artificial gulf between Marxism-Leninism and other modern, progressive social teachings, to reject the universal application of certain provisions of scientific socialism, and to abandon attempts to dogmatically apply them without taking account of specific historical conditions was noted. In elaborating the new CPSU program it is important, as was stated during the discussion, to avoid the previous vagueness in assessing the social and theoretical foundations of the life of society and the party.

The socialist choice determines the strategy and tactics of the movement toward a society of social justice. Of course, the theory of scientific socialism is not the ultimate authority, but a method of seeking this truth.

The priority provision of our ideology is the socialist ideal and the belief in its viability and future. The socialist ideal is essentially progressive. It contains a call for the liberation of working people from exploitation, and highly important fundamental provisions of humanism.

The socialist choice today is not a slogan. It is a call of the times. The idea of the socialist choice envisages the observance of working people's interests, the exercise of their rights, and the provision of social protection for them. Today it is being transformed in Soviet people's specific work and actions: In their observance of the constitutions of the USSR and the sovereign republics, and of other acts of legislation, and in the determination of their attitude to the Union Treaty, to the creation of a genuinely humane, democratic, and rule-of-law state, to the government's anticrisis program, and to military reform. It should not be forgotten that the socialist choice represents the creation of a society in which the "free development of each individual is a condition for the free development of all."

In the opinion of the discussion participants, the political slogans of the day are: To safeguard the Soviet people's ideological and organizational unity, to consolidate all the country's progressive forces, to preserve the state's political and economic integrity, to achieve national harmony, to ensure the economic efficiency of production, to create a living standard worthy of our people, and to guarantee the country's internal and external security.

The discussion participants devoted considerable time to analyzing the problem of party members' general sociopolitical state. It can be described as Communists' political and moral awareness. It is seen in the selection, analysis, and transformation of the political directives, judgments, sentiments, and interests shown in society for their practical activity. Communists are typified not by blind faith but by a critically aware position which has become a personal conviction, and by their level of political culture. USSR People's Deputy Lieutenant General M.S. Surkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Armed Forces CPSU Organization All-Army Party Committee, took part in the discussion.

Military Journalists Confer; Surkov Speaks

PM2606095191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Military Journalists' Conference"]

[Text] A conference took place 17 June in the M.V. Frunze Soviet Army Central House with the editors of military journals and district, group, and fleet newspapers.

Colonel General G. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, delivered a report "On the State of and Measures To Further Improve the Activity of the Military Mass Media in Contemporary Conditions."

Comrades M. Skoromnyy, B. Yamshanov, L. Prodanchuk, V. Chizhevskiy, L. Goloviyev, N. Semenov, D. Ilyuk, and others took part in the debate on the report.

The participants in the conference were addressed by Lieutenant General M. Surkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU organization's All-Army Party Committee.

Baltic Republics

Estonia-USSR Delegations Hold Talks in Moscow

Official Previews Talks With Moscow

LD2706090691 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 0600 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Today at noon another round of USSR-Republic of Estonia talks will begin in Moscow. In an interview with the Estonian press agency, ETA, Ulo Nugis, leader of our delegation, said that any discussion of security problems is likely to be a real test for the Estonian side. Indeed, there are no specialists in the field in Estonia, and statistical data—being a USSR military secret—are inaccessible to Estonia. At the request of the USSR delegation serious attention will be paid this time to issues of USSR ownership and to social protection of the non-indigenous population.

Ulo Nugis asserted that the Estonian delegation will still be aiming for a comprehensive approach, starting from a historical-legal evaluation to the incorporation of Estonia in the USSR down to issues of the security system. The USSR delegation has not opposed the plan.

'Serious Conversation' Predicted

LD2706105291 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Report from Moscow by correspondent Jaan Raudsepp]

[Excerpt] Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet, met with Eduard Shevardnadze last night during a stop-over in Moscow. According to Mr Ruutel, there was a discussion on both world and domestic political issues. At 1600 today [1300 GMT] Arnold Ruutel met with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. "There will be a serious conversation," Mr. Ruutel said before leaving for the Kremlin. "I am carrying a document of prime importance for the future of independent Estonia." But as it is not Mr. Ruutel's habit to rely on forecasts and assumptions, our brief meeting on that.

[Estonian] Finance Minister Rein Miller also had a tense working day here in the Moscow summer heat, and we will continue with him. You returned here today to the [Estonian] mission looking like a soldier who is still hanging on to his shield very firmly.

[Miller] Well, yes, one could say that today the first round of the talks with the Union finance Ministry came to an end, and this has been going on for nearly six months already. Today we signed a protocol together with USSR Finance Minister Orlov, and this will determine our republic's and the Union's financial relations. But I would say that this is, well, a preliminary protocol only, and it needs to oe endorsed by the republican supreme Soviet. We signed to the effect that our republic will participate in the financing of various Union programs—I specifically stress that it is programs which are being financed, and not payments into the Union budget—with 186 million rubles [R]. Is this too much or too little, radio listeners can decide for themselves when I tell them that last year we paid R240 million into the Union budget. The Union budget claims were, of course, considerably bigger: They wanted R1.3 billion.

[Raudsepp] So, the difference in the sums of money is quite considerable and then, we were even listened to when wanting to finance some programs. Evidently this, too, is....

[Miller interrupts] Indeed, I would say that it was an ideological victory. When we spoke of these principles at the beginning of the year at the level of deputy USSR finance minister and at the level of the [republican] minister—we had discussions with them—there was no desire to listen to this at all; instead, it was demanded that we strictly observe the law on the Union tax and that we transfer the relevant sums of money into the Union budget. So I find that this was indeed an ideological victory, so to speak, in this respect. [passage omitted]

Pavlov Receives Savisaar

LD2706105491 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 0900 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] At the moment we can add from Moscow only a brief item of news. Edgar Savisaar, leader of the Estonian Government, met with USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov this morning. Topical issues of economic cooperation were discussed, as well as prospects for future bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Estonia.

Military Issues Discussed

LD2706133191 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1200 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Today at 1200 another meeting between the Estonian and USSR delegations is taking place in Moscow. The Estonian delegation is led by Ulo Nugis, speaker of the Supreme Soviet; and the USSR delegation by Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov. Ulo Nugis told the Baltic News Service before the meeting opened that a wide range of issues will be discussed. Before the meeting opened the Estonian delegation presented its proposals to the Soviet side concerning the resolution of military issues between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Estonia.

Estonia recognizes in the document the significance of its location from the point of view of organizing USSR air defenses, and yet at the same time it is noted that in connection with the liquidation of the Warsaw Pact organization the focus of tension in Europe has been abolished and for this reason Estonia's strategic importance—proceeding from Soviet interests—has considerably diminished. In this connection, and also in connection with the fact that the presence of USSR forces on Estonian territory constitutes a constant focus of danger of political and military conflict, the Estonian side

recommends that the presence of Soviet forces on Estonian territory is viewed as a temporary phenomenon. Estonia recognizes that the presence of the main contingent of USSR military and naval forces is permissible up until complete withdrawal of Soviet forces from Germany.

For the purpose of protecting territorial integrity, independence, citizen's security and their rights, the Republic of Estonia will set up its own defense forces. This is what is contained in the proposals from the Estonian delegation. In the document presented to the USSR delegation the Republic of Estonia announces that it makes no claim to owning any weapons of mass destruction and that it is ready to ratify the nuclear nonproliferation treaty as has already been done by the Lithuanian parliament.

The meeting of the delegations continues.

Communique Signed With Democratic Russia

LD2706135391 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1200 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Report from Moscow by correspondent Jaan Raudsepp]

[Excerpt] A meeting of representatives of our [Estonian] People's Front and Government with representatives of the Democratic Russia Movement has just ended at the Estonian mission in Moscow. The result of this work of several hours was a joint communique. Mr. Savisaar [chairman of the Estonian Government], how would you characterize this document?

[Savisaar] I think that it is an important document. If one keeps in mind what kind of forces have signed it, then on one hand the Democratic Russia Movement is indeed the most influential force in today's Russia; in essence, it is the force which carried out Boris Yeltsin's election campaign and it has a very considerable group of people within the Russian parliament. And for this reason we are not talking here of some kind of a marginal group which can say whatever it likes and nothing will change. Instead, it is indeed a political force of the kind that in practice is implmenting the politics of the new Russia.

The points included in the communique are: First, that the Democratic Russia Movement will discuss within its parliamentary faction and raise in the Supreme Soviet the issue of prompt ratification of the Estonian-Russian treaty. Second, the issue of economic cooperation which notes specifically that despite Russian participation in the new Union treaty, the principles of bilateral relations will nevertheless remain unchanged and of the kind that were agreed upon in our economic treaty. Third, the issue of military provocations, and readiness is expressed—by the Military for Democracy movement—to assist us. Perhaps most important for Estonia is the fourth point. I will read it: To formulate the position of the Democratic Russia Movement on the issue of the Baltic occupation by the Soviet Union in 1940, and to bring the issue for discussion at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet. For me this is the key issue of the communique.

Then, the fifth and the sixth points here deal with cooperation in the spheres of culture and ethnic culture both with people of Russian origin living here [in Estonia] as well as with Estonians living in Russia, with cultural centers to be created in Tallinn and Narva on the one hand and in Moscow and Pskov on the other. The last section is purely between the movements: cooperation in exchanges of information, exchange of drafts of legislative acts, and cooperation in election campaigns.

Finally we agreed that next time we will meet in Tallinn on 10 August. Then we will see which of these points have been pushed forward a bit in their implementation. The subject for the Tallinn conference will be: What would be realistic ways of restoring state independence in the Baltic states, and how Russian democracy could lend a helping hand. [passage omitted]

Talks Produce 'Very Modest Results'

LD2706163591 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Budris]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—A meeting of official delegations from the Soviet Union and Estonia ended here today, producing very modest results.

The Soviet side "behaves like a boss with an employee" at talks on Estonian independence, Estonian chief negotiator Julo Nugis told TASS after the meeting.

The sides did not reach an agreement on social issues that were discussed today, Nugis said.

The Estonian delegation will have to "analyse the meeting's results additionally and, probably, change the Estonian position in principle", he said.

Negotiations, however, will continue and the next meeting has been scheduled for August 6 at the Estonian mission in Moscow, he said.

The meeting will discuss bilateral economic relations and Estonia's incorporation into the Soviet Union in 1939-1940.

Talks Termed 'Farce'

OW2806063891 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The meeting on Thursday between delegations of the USSR and Estonia was nothing but farce—said the speaker of the republic's parliament Ulo Nugis in an interview with BF [BALTFAX]. He notes "a marked deterioration in the Soviet attitude towards Estonia"

and finds that "the Soviet Union has no desire to conduct honest talks with it."

The opinion is based on the "completely undiplomatic," as Nugis put it, conduct of the Soviet delegation's leader—USSR Vice Premier Nikolay Laverov. Nugis has told BF that Laverov refused to give the floor to the member of the Estonian delegation Endel Lippmaa who wanted to report the results of expert groups work on questions of defence and security.

Laverov told the Estonian side, "You behave as if you were representing an independent state, whereas you are still a union republic, so we can't know where it will end."

Nugis points out that the USSR had not prepared any basic documents for the meeting, only sharp criticism of Estonia's proposals.

The agenda was supposed to include questions of USSR property in Estonia and social guarantees to the non-Estonian population. But the sides failed to reach a compromise even in such a field as recognizing each others university and college diplomas.

Nugis expressed in the interviw with BF his surprise at the changed position of the USSR since the atmosphere was quite different in the preparation for the meeting.

On June 26 a meeting was also held in Moscow between the Chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Arnold Ruutel and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev when the Estonian leader unsuccessfuly sought signing a document recognizing a transitional period in Estonia.

Nugis found the meeting on June 27 a "tactical defeat for Estonia" but, on the other hand, he did not rule out a strategic benefit out of it.

Next meeting of the delegations has been appointd for August 10, again in Moscow. The agenda includes questions of Estonia's economic treaty with the USSR for 1992, and, on the insistence of the Estonian side, the historical and legal aspects of Estonia's inclusion in the USSR.

European Council Session Discusses Baltics

LD2806011691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2130 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] In Helsinki today, the parliamentary session of the European Council discussed the sitatuion in the Baltic states. Taking part in it were the parliament heads of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The probelm of the Baltics statehood will be considered tomorrow, too, behind closed doors.

At a news conference held today, the Baltic leaders condemned yesterday's raid of the Black Berets in Vilnius.

Meanwhile, the head of the Soviet delegation, Aleksey Yeliseyev, during his news conference, reaffirmed the Kremlin's invariable position that the Baltics' independence is an internal probelm of the Soviet Union.

Today in the afternoon, the parliament heads of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were received by the Finnish prime minister, Esko Aho.

From Helsinki, Vytautas Landsbergis is tomorrow flying to Germany, where he is to meet the country's defense minister and the federal prime ministers.

Ruutel Addresses Council

OW2806050591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A parliamentary session of the European Council devoted to the Baltic question is being held in Helsinki June 27. It includes parliamentary delegations of all three Baltic republic headed by their parliamentary leaders—Vytautas Landsbergis, Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Arnold Ruutel, also a USSR parliamentary delegation. The Baltic delegations also include spokesmen of the parliamentary minorities.

Acording to Lithuanian radio the leaders made reports at the opening session on the situation in their republics, and at the second session of the Baltic and Soviet delegations will answer questions of the European Council members.

During the opening session the Chairman of the EC committee on links with non-member countries, David Atkinson, said that the results of today's session will form part of a report on the situation in the Baltic area. The report is being prepared for the next session of the assembly in Paris in early September.

The leader of the Soviet delegation Aleksey Yeliseyev held on the eve of the conference, June 26, a press conference in Helsinki stressing that the Baltic question is a Soviet internal affair, and that the Soviet delegation had agreed to participate in the discussion in Helsinki only because the question is being considered there in great detail and with much attention.

As reported by the press service of Estonia's Foreign Ministry, A. Ruutel stated in his introductory speech: "As long as the democratically elected representatives of the Baltic peoples are not sovereign on their states' territory, they can't be responsible for many [word as received] economic, ecological and human rights problems. All that has been done so far in Estonia has cost enormous effort in constant conflict with our neighbour refusing to recognize the norms of international law."

Besides, the leader of Estonia's Supreme Soviet told those present that at his Wednesday's meeting with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev he "resolutely rejected invitations to take part in any form in the renewed Union."

Vladimir Malkovskiy representing the socialist faction in Estonia's parliament spoke of what he sees as violations of the non-Estonian population's rights, citing the examples of the Estonian laws on elections and language, and described the situation in the republic with education in Russian, and the process of privatisation also, in his opinion, discriminating against the non-Estonian population.

Further on OMON Telephone Exchange Seizure

Landsbergis Condemns 'Terrorist Act'

LD2706115891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, who is currently on a visit to France condemned the actions of the Speicial Purpose Militia Detachments [OMON] in Vilnius. In an interview to a French radio, Landsbergis said that the occupation of the telegraph and telephone exchange in Vilnius was a terrorist act by which the OMON is attempting to provoke armed clashes with the people of Lithuania.

Gorbachev Kept Informed

LD2706181591 Berlin ADN in German 1744 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—President Mikhail Gorbachev was immediately informed about events in vilnius, presidential spokesman Ignatenko confirmed today in response to an inquiry from INTERFAX. After the urgent request to Interior Minister Pugo to immediately clarify what had happened, the president has been kept up to date. Representatives of the judicial authorities were in Vilnius. "However, one cannot shake off the impression that someone is trying to disrupt the situation before the president of the USSR's meeting with the leading persons of G-7 by such provacative actions," Ignatenko said.

Gorbachev Orders Investigation

LD2706184191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today our correspondent asked Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of the president's press service, how Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev reacted to the events in Vilnius on 26 June. The president was of course immediately informed, he said. He is familiar with the situation. He issued urgent instructions to USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Pugo to investigate what happened without delay. As you know, the relevant representatives of the law enforcement organs are already in Vilnius. It is difficult to escape the impression that by means of such provocative actions certain people are seeking to spoil the atmosphere prior to the USSR president's meeting with leaders of the Seven in London.

Lithuania Cables Doguzhiyev

LD2706184691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1800 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania Ceslovas Stankevicius today sent a telegram to Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev. It says:

I draw with great concern your attention to the continuing attacks on civilian institutions of the Republic of Lithuania and the violence of the Soviet Union's special units in using weapons against peaceful people. Yesterday such actions were carried out at the central telegraph and telephone exchange in our capital, Vilnius. For several hours the residents of the Republic of Lithuania, including the Soviet Union's citizens residing in Lithuania, were deprived of inter-town and international communications. Thus their rights were deliberately and crudely violated.

In view of the fact that the radio and television buildings and the house of the press occupied nearly half a year ago by the Soviet Union's armed units have not yet been returned to the Republic of Lithuania, yesterday's action provokes special concern. The question arises whether the Soviet Union, continuing this policy, is not aiming to continue to deprive the Republic of Lithuania of the means of communications, thus violating the rights of its inhabitants and free exchange of information.

I remember with satisfaction the common opinion reached by us that priority should be given not to soldiers but to diplomats, and that acts of coercion do not correspond to the spirit of negotiations and do not help to strengthen trust.

The Lithuanian side, as before, is firmly adhering to the position creating prerequisites for definite rejection of the use of force and for the settlement of relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union by political negotiations.

Attack Could Be Prelude to Coup

LD2706105991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Report by Lithuanian Supreme Council spokesman Audrius Azubalis at news conference in Vilnius on 27 June—recorded]

[Text] Here is the latest news which I have received from esteemed Leonas Asmontas, minister of power engineering of the Republic of Lithuania, which allows us to make a conclusion that this certainly was not an accidental attack. As esteemed Stankevicius stressed yesterday, this was a planned action, and it seems that if it had not been for our and your immediate reaction—the communication lines were not disrupted one hundred percent—so if it had not been for your and our immediate reaction, and let us say, if it had not been for the telephone calls to Moscow from our leadership—

although they reached only units on duty or persons on duty—then probably more serious consequences would have taken place. I remind you that our leadership failed to contact Pugo, Pavlov, Doguzhiyev and Moiseyev yesterday. Zhytnikov, commander of the division of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs troops, dissociated himself from this event.

Now I would like to go back to the point which indicates that a provocation on a much wider scale must have been planned.

According to the current information received from Asmontas yesterday, two more incidents took place which had not yet been recorded. The exact time [of these incidents] has not yet been established—they took place sometime after 1800.

Unidentified persons dressed in civilian clothes attempted to break into two electrical substations in Vilnius. One of the substations is not far from the railway station, and if they had succeeded in doing this then the entire city center of Vilnius, and of course both the government, the parliament, all residents, and all offices in the center would have been without electricity. However, it appears that they failed to break in, and as the esteemed minister remarked jokingly, the crowbar they had with them was too small.

However, they managed to break into the electrical substation in Zverynas and there was no power for about an hour in Zverynas. The exact time is presently being determined; the esteemed minister could not tell me the exact time these incidents took place.

Well, as you can imagine, if communications are cut off and if at the same time the electric power is also cut off, then a real prelude for a genuine coup is set up. This is what every professional organizer of a coup d'etat does in such cases: he cuts off the power, the communications systems, and so on and so forth.

What is more, today the minister of power engineering spoke to Vitaliy Konovalov, the USSR minister of power engineering, and told him what had happened in Lithuania and said that if such incidents continue to occur we will be forced to mothballl the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES] because there is a certain danger in this, although perhaps this danger is not felt immediately. Reliable operation at an AES depends not only on power supply equipment but also on the reliability of power engineering system; power supply lines should be reserved for the needs of the power station, and communications should be maintained with the control room of the power engineering, which is in Riga, and which coordinates the work of the entire western system. If this communication system is disrupted, then the actions of the personnel cannot be coordinated and the lack of information, as the esteemed minister said, could not only cause incidents but could also cause accidents at the AES.

Pugo Role in Seizure Discussed

LD2806055191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0000 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Text] A briefing took place at the USSR Interior Ministry, at which the journalists who were present were given an official version of the actions of the Vilnus special purpose militia detachment [OMON] who conducted an operation the other day to confiscate weapons in the Vilnius central telephone exchange and telegraph building. Correspondent Anatoliy Fedorov asked militia Colonel Andrey Grigoryevich Chernenko, head of the public relations center, to comment on the situation. Here is the recording:

[Begin Chernenko recording] In order to specify and to cut short certain things that were mentioned in a number of publications, or perhaps to reinforce them, I would like to say that at 1631 on 26 June a small OMON group arrived at the building of the intercity telephone station in Vilnus on [name indistinct] street. In the course of the event, in one of the ground floor rooms, the OMON personnel—and I want to emphasize this: in the presence of the telephone station's director, witnesses, and a representative of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry, who had also arrived—they discovered, confiscated, and documented 10 TNT charges of 200 g each, 10 TNT cylindrical charges of 75 g each, a homemade small caliber pistol, 48 cartridges, 32 9-mm cartridges, 10 rifle cartridges of 7.62-mm caliber, and 24.5 m bickford fuse. I would like to specify here that all the actions of the OMON personnel and of the procuracy in confiscating weapons were filmed on video.

Another significant detail is that in his report to the procurator of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the director of the telephone station and the administration unequivocally declared that they had no objections about the actions of the OMON personnel.

I would like to make three points clear: First, was the OMON acting on the basis of an agreement with the procuracy? Yes. It was acting on an agreement with the Lithuanian SSR procuracy. The events were undertaken in connection with the information that had been received and that had a sufficiently high degree of probability. It concerned the storage of ammunition and explosives; not the amounts, but the fact itself. I think what is interesting—I had a look at the summary of the operations today—similar weapons confiscation operations were conducted yesterday across the whole territory of the USSR—not in one, two, or three places, but in tens of places. Much more threatening weapons were confiscated. Submachine guns, machine guns, and explosives were found. In the town of Uryupinsk, for instance, it did not give rise to... [changes thought] well, it is clear that there are big politics, there is some Baltic context, or rather, accent. We all understand this. We hope, however, for a certain objectivity on the part of those present.

Third, [as heard] did the USSR Interior Minister, Comrade Pugo, know about the operation that was allegedly under preparation? Taking into consideration the time factor and the urgency with which everything was done, and taking into consideration that, if the minister gave his approval for each case of weapons seizure over the last 24 to 48 hours—and it is a matter of tens and even hundreds of guns—I think he would have drowned in this sea of information. Comrade Pugo did not keep the situation under control.

Nobody is intending to cross the T's and dot the I's in this situation. Investigation is under way on the issue of storing these weapons. I can only say one thing: From the point of view of common sense and proceeding from reality, such things always have a certain political aspect in people's minds. However, in this particular situation, it was such a local operation. One cannot even call it an operation, judging by the number of people involved it was such a local, minor issue. To speak of a need for Comrade Pugo to give or not give his approval simply causes a certain irritation and causes fears where no fears should actually exist. [end recording]

Vagnorius: 'No Justification'

LD2706194591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius, assessing the seizure of the telephone exchange in Vilnius, has stated that there cannot be justification for such actions by the Black Berets. We cannot understand for whom these actions could be useful, because in any case they are not useful either to Lithuania or the Soviet Union, the government leader said.

The version that the attackers acted independently of Moscow is very doubtful, because the Lithuanian Government first heard about the withdrawal of Black Berets from the telephone exchange from Moscow officials, and only later was this information confirmed by the Lithuanian Ministry of Communications. Asked who passed this information from Moscow, Gediminas Vagnorius stated, without mentioning names, that it came from high-ranking officials of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ministry of Communications.

Apart from that, the premier told Radio Vilnius that, for instance, the Soviet minister of communications was very astonished on being informed about the seizure of the Vilnius telephone exchange, while the minister of internal affairs was not very astonished.

The greatest damage caused by the incident is not material but moral, since society is being unnecessarily excited. Maybe, this is being done intentionally in order to get people used to such actions, in preparation for later quietly seizing the most important state buildings. The leader of the Lithuanian Government warned the inhabitants of Latvia and Estonia about this in his interviews with the televisions of these states. I do not think that political issues can be solved by such means, Gediminas Vagnorius said.

The prime minister also said that the government has taken the most urgent measures to reduce the danger created in Lithuania by a single unit of the Soviet military. The Ministry of Internal Affairs has been instructed to strengthen protection of the most important state buildings. Some of them are being guarded with arms and would be defended in case of an attack. However, Gediminas Vagnorius said that Lithuania does not intend to defend its independence with arms. Our main weapon the premier stated, is peaceful struggle, striving to settle by peaceful means the relations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. To any actions by the enemies of Lithuania's independence, we reply calmly, do not yield in confusion but, on the contrary, endeavor to talk with Moscow in a constructive and businesslike manner. At the time when the telephone exchange was seized, the Lithuanian Government endeavored to explain by every means to the Kremlin that this was not useful to both sides and that it would be expedient to sit down as quickly as possible at the negotiating table.

Minister Abisala told Vilnius radio that attempts have been made to speak on the telephone to Soviet Premier Pavlov, his deputy, Doguzhiyev, and also the chief of the general staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, General Moiseyev, but they were not invited to the telephone.

So far the Lithuanian Government has not recieved any official reply from Moscow about the seizure of the telephone exchange. According to Gediminas Vagnorius, such a reply, will, most likely, be published through TASS channels, as has happened more than once in the past.

Later Moscow's version indirectly reached the government. It alleged that the Black Berets were fulfilling the decree of the Soviet president on the confiscation of illegal weapons. This is laughable, said the head of the Lithuanian Government, as in such institutions as the telephone exchange even the guards have no weapons. I think, Gediminas Vagnorius continued, that today there is no sense in making explanations to the Soviet plunderers and discussing such incidents. The most important thing to us is to discuss the possible strategy of Soviet actions, our stand, and the further process of the negotiations between both sides. Our peaceful policy during the attacks on the border posts and customs offices has already proved to the world what kind of people the Black Berets and Soviet soldiers are. I think, Gediminas Vagnorius said, that after this incident the West would not wish even to imagine the possibilities.

All this was stated this evening by the head of the government at a press conference.

Meanwhile the government press bureau stated today that this provocation was yet another attempt by the conservative forces to increase tension and suppress the democratic processes in Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

Vagnorious Discusses Incident

LD2706161291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuania 1200 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Interview with Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorious by unidentified reporter; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Reporter] Mr Vagnorius, does it seem to you that the Vilnius OMON [Special purpose militia detachment] is a weapon in the hands of Minister Pugo and Marshal Yazov against Gorbachev, for it is precisely on the eve of Gorbachev's important international meetings, like before the meeting in Norway and now on the eve of meeting with the leaders of the seven most developed states, that provocative actions are carried out which undermine Gorbachev's prestige, since he had promised not to use force in the Baltics.

[Vagnorius] I would only like to add: Or is it an attempt to demonstrate that this is so? We can only make a guess about it, however, in any case, if this is what we say, or as I say, then this is [word indistinct] in this kind of situation. [passage omitted] I think that in any case such acts are not useful to the Soviet Union because today to win something or to gain something by using such means is simply not possible. In this case we are winning.

[Reporter] Can you tell me please, does Lithuania supply food to the Soviet troops stationed on the territory of Lithuania?

[Vagnorious] We are meeting our contractual obligations to the Soviet Union including supplying food, and this is part of the amount which has to be sent to the Soviet Union, only it remains here in these organizations. Of course we have the possibility, if we do not see any future, of course we can cut off these supplies. We hope that we will come to an agreement by peaceful means. [passage omitted]

We have already prepared a specific contract on the economic agreement for 1991-1992. Joint steps for the implementation of certain measures to improve the economy i.e. all the common problems which are almost the same both here and in the Soviet Union, have been put into this contract. [passage omitted] We directed all the measures in such a way that all the existing economic links which have developed are not cut off artificially. [passage omitted]

A meeting of the Baltic Council is to take place. One of the questions discussed there will be the issue of how we are going to live if an economic blockade is imposed. [passage omitted]

MVD Official Explains Action

LD2706163191 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—The action involving the Vilnius telephone exchange has been carried out in strict compliance with law and is not political, said head of the Soviet Interior Ministry's [MVD] press centre, Andrey Chernenko. He made this comment at a briefing, dealing with Wednesday's incident in the Lithuanian capital.

He recalled that an OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] group arrived at the building of the international telephone exchange at 16:30 Moscow time on June 26. In one of the first-floor rooms of the building 20 Trotyl blocks, a home-made small-calibre pistol, a large amount of cartridges and 24 metres of safety fuse were discovered in the presence of the exchange chief, witnesses and representatives of the Lithuanian Interior Ministry. Actions by OMON men and officers of the Lithuanian Procurator's Office, who also took part in this action, were recorded on video.

In an explanatory note to the procurator of the Republic, Chernenko said, the chief of the telephone exchange and administration said they had no complaints about OMON. OMON's actions were sanctioned by the procurator of Lithuania (it is subordinate to the USSR procurator). OMON staged a search on receiving information about the storage of ammunition and explosives.

Such commonplace actions, Chernenko continued, to confiscate illegally-stored arms were and are carried out on the territory of the country daily on a large scale and with more impressive results.

Asked if Soviet Interior Minister Boris Pugo knew in advance about the planned operation, Chernenko said: "The minister did not know. If he had to order every case of arms confiscation he would have drowned in a sea of information. This would have also impaired the promptness and effectiveness of militia actions."

OMON Official Comments

LD2706141491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] As we have already reported, the telephone exchange in Vilnius was occupied by a subunit of the OMON [special purpose militia detachment] of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs yesterday. Our correspondent Svetlana Premudrova has just telephoned details about this.

[Premudrova] At 1630 approximately 20 armed members of the OMON occupied the republican trunk telephone exchange. All the staff were enclosed in one building and ordered to stay put. One of the OMON members, who was reluctant to be faced with the question—why did you occupy the exchange—replied, and I quote: We are fulfilling an order of the USSR Ministers of Defense and Internal Affairs on protecting municipal economy buildings. The head of the OMON, Major (?Baleta Mukatanovich), stated that, according to the information of the Lithuanian procurator's office—and we have two procurator's offices, and this is outside the

law of the Lithuanian Republic—an operation to confiscate weapons is being carried out. According to the major, cartridges, a pistol—just one—and a Molotov cocktail were found. Journalists wanted to photograph the things which were confiscated, but (?Mukatunovich) merely replied that this was impossible because everything had already been taken away.

Meanwhile, my colleagues saw how people who were known to them, carrying cameras and under guard, surreptitiously and rapidly took photographs of crates which appeared from somewhere, probably with ammunition or some other articles. It is very possible that on the screens of the Soviet Lithuania Tele-Radio Association, which, incidentally, is registered in Moscow, and the All-Union Television, there will in time be shown sequences depicting how another operation of guerillas from Sajudis and nationalist extremists, preparing for further bloodshed, was averted.

At 1840 the OMON left the republican trunk telephone exchange and communications were restored. Svetlana Premudrova, Independent Lithuania Radio.

We asked Egidijus Bickauskas, the Lithuanian Republic's permanent representative in Moscow, to comment on this event.

[Begin recording] I see yesterday's events as one of the crudest provocations, the objective of which was to provoke retaliation by the Lithuanian state structures, and also to undermine those processes which are being carried out both in Lithuania and in Russia. Yesterday's TASS report, which was read out in the Vremya program and published in the press today, appears to anyone who is even slightly familiar with these matters—if you will forgive my discourteous expression—laughable. An operation to confiscate weapons is carried out, and Bickford safety fuses situated for one reason or another in a telephone exchange there are confiscated.

I am sure that those young armed lads who took part in this act and are from the OMON and who were acting on behalf of the USSR, did not fully understand the huge provocative campaign they were participating in. I think it is probably time the USSR president defined his position on the escapades of the OMON which are going on all the time. By not reacting to this, he is simply becoming an instigator of future provocations. However, at the end of the day, and he himself probably does not wish this, he will become a hostage of these extremely reactionary forces. [end recording]

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reported today that the Lithuanian permanent mission in Moscow was informed at the Vilnius base of the OMON that, having seized the telephone exchange, the OMON had fulfilled an order of USSR Internal Affairs Minister [MVD] Boris Pugo. We asked a spokesman of the USSR MVD's press center to comment on this.

[Begin recording] You ask for our information, the official information of the USSR MVD press center, where it states that these actions were carried out without the knowledge of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [end recording]

Official Calls Attacks Provocative

OW2806054991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1400 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Egidijus Bickauskas, Lithuania's permanent representative in Moscow, said that he thought it probable that OMON's (Riot Police) performance last Wednesday in Vilnius had been intended to impair Mikhail Gorbachev's future meeting with the leaders of the Big Seven in London, or probably even wreck it altogether.

In an exclusive interview to a BF [BALTFAX] correspondent, he described it as an outrage and an attempt to "put pressure on us."

"The Soviet leadership, including President Gorbachev, ought to realise that, by paying no attention to this brigandage, they actually encourage OMON to new outrages," he said.

"Mikhail Gorbachev should take a definite stance. A few days ago, he did this on one occasion. He spoke his mind and made it clear he didn't want to make common cuase with them," said Bickauskas, meaning the Soviet President's speech in the USSR Supreme Soviet at the end of last week, when he came down on the conservatives. "I think he should do this again and pledge to have nothing to do with any political machinations in Lithuania."

Bickauskas said it was not improbable that there might be more excesses before Gorbachev left for London.

Lithuania's communications minister, Kostas Birulis, said on Lithuanian television on Wednesday night that the damage OMON had done amounted to 60,000 rubles. Birulis said he had had a telephone conversation with the USSR communications minister, and that the latter had condemned OMON's action.

A BF correspondent has reported from Vilnius that the chairman of the Republic's Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, learned about the incident before his meeting with the French Premier, Edith Cresson, and informed her about it.

Moscow Urged To Renounce Force

OW2806052091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1530 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Deputy-Chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet Ceslovas Stankevicius has expressed concern over "continued attacks on civilian institutions of the Lithuanian Republic and armed violence on the part of special units formed by the USSR against unarmed peaceful people." He has sent a cable to the leader of the Soviet delegation

in the talks with Lithuania, Vice Premier Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, in connection with an incident in Vilnius on June 26 when a unit of special purpose militia [OMON] seized the central telephone exchange and cut off the Lithuanian capital's telephone communications.

"The Lithuanian Republic firmly adheres to the position repudiating the use of force and regulating relations between Lithuania and the USSR through political talks," emphasized C. Stankevicius.

Other Attacks on Utilities Cited

OW2806052791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1400 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Audrius Ajubalis, press secretary of Lithuania's parliament, told reporters on Thursday about two incidents that occurred on June 26 at the time when OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] attacked the local telephone exchange. At about 18:00 several men in mufti tried to break into the buildings of two electric transformer stations in Vilnius. They managed to break into one of these and cut electricity supplies to a district in Vilnius for an hour.

They did not manage to break into the other station which provides electricity for Vilnius's central district that houses the government and parliament.

According to A. Ajubalis, this shows that in fact a more extensive operation was planned, but it failed because Lithuania's leaders reacted accordingly.

On Wednesday, when OMON members captured the telephone exchange, two officials from the Home Defense Office were there, said the press secretary. Their resistance would have been pointless, since the building has glass walls.

As BF'S [BALTFAX] correspondent reports from Vilnius, Lithuania's minister of energy Ashmantas spoke by telephone on Wednesday with his USSR counterpart Vitaliy Konovalov and informed him of what had happened. If such things take place again, said that Lithuanian minister, we'll have to suspend work at the Ignalina nuclear-power plant since a loss of communication puts the plant's monitoring systems out of action which is fraught with grave consequences for Lithuania and for the northwestern engergy system as a whole.

In the meantime BF's correspondent learned at the press service of Lithuania's parliament that the Ignalina nuclear-power plant did not lose communication with the center since it has a high-frequency telephone channel.

Lithuania 'Peculiar' Preparations for Anniversary

PM2806122591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

["What The Facts Show" article by Captain 2d Class V. Gromak: "The Meaning Of LAF"]

[Excerpts] A tragic date in the Soviet people's history—the 50th anniversary of the start of the Great Patriotic War—is nigh. Lithuania is preparing for it in its own peculiar way.

At a rally in the "Banga" House of Culture, S. Buskevicius, ringleader of the Kaunas "Jaunalietuviai" [young Lithuanians], cynically declared that the day must be celebrated in Lithuania as a major festival. There have been many articles, too, in republican government newspapers extolling the day the war began. "On that day," Vanda Kuskiene writes in the newspaper LIETUVOS AIDAS, "50 years ago, the Lithuanian people began their struggle for independence."

It was on 23 June 1941, the writer claims, that the "Lithuanian Activists' Front," LAF for short, began its operations. It had been organized in Lithuania in 1940, but its coordinating center was abroad—in Berlin. At 0928 hours on 23 June 1941, LAF representative A. Prakulienis announced the formation of a new Lithuanian Government. So, the writer assures us, active resistance to the Germans and then to the "second Soviet occupation" had begun.

An innocent reader might actually believe these and similar fairy stories. Because the hundreds of thousands of people who perished through the LAF's wishes cannot say anything, and the "activists" themselves who avoided retribution remain silent. But there are still people alive today who remember what the LAF actually did. They can tell you how the provisional government formed in Kaunas on 23 June welcomed the Hitlerite warriors with open arms. The gangs of gunmen wearing white armbands and shooting Red Army soldiers in the back were also from the LAF. [passage omitted]

Recently, in the newspaper ZINGENAI, I read a statement by the "Lithuanian Activists' Front" (LAF). Not, of course, the one that sank into oblivion, along with its masters, in the forties. But a young one, full of vigor, ready to "continue the resistance cause" and augment the traditions of its bloody predecessor. To that end, all men are being urged to join the ranks of the Lithuanian police support detachment, in order to be able to "switch to active resistance" if the need arises.

On 19 June the republican Academy of Sciences holds a conference which will discuss "questions of the Lithuanians' June 1941 struggle for independence."

New Latvian Law Will Spark Confrontation

PM2806083191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Correspondent I. Litvinova report: "Has Latvia Seceded From the USSR Again?"]

[Text] Riga—Maybe without even suspecting it themselves, the inhabitants of Latvia seem to be beginning to live in some new state. This has happened after the Supreme Soviet adopted 20 June on its first reading the "Fundamental Law of the Latvian Republic for the Transitional Period."

Perhaps that was the first day that the approaches to Latvia's future on the part of the opposition and of a section of the centrists of the People's Front faction had coincided so thoroughly. Withdrawing its own proposal, the "Equal Rights" opposition faction subscribed to the proposal of one of the moderate People's Front members: to postpone the adoption of the draft law, submitting it first for nationwide discussion. A dramatic vote and—adopted!

Then something almost incomprehensible both to journalists and to observers began to happen. After taking a break and evidently pressuring its deputies, the People's Front faction arranged... a revote. The opposition left the hall of plenary sessions in protest.

Why did the draft law cause a commotion in parliament?

According to the draft law prepared by a working group of People's Front deputies, the 1922 Constitution has de jure force in Latvia in 1991. The transitional period established by last year's declaration is to end in the restoration of the Latvian Republic's independent state power and the election of the Seimas. As soon as the Seimas takes power into its own hands, the legitimately elected Supreme Soviet people's deputies will lay down their powers and disband themselves.

Those articles in the 1922 Constitution which govern Latvia's independence and territorial integrity must not be altered or repealed during the transitional period. Thus, the demand for the return to Latvia of the lands of the present Pytalovskiy Rayon of Pskov Oblast is surfacing again.

For the first time in a year of legislative activity "citizens' rights and duties" and "persons' rights and duties" have been rigidly divided into sections.

Who are these "persons?"—the opposition asked. It followed from the answer that they are "noncitizens." And since not one of the draft laws examined in the Supreme Soviet commissions (except for that submitted by the opposition) provides for citizenship to be acquired by all who now live in Latvia, it turned out that the discriminatory norm regarding a section of the voters who elected this Supreme Soviet is approved by the constitutional law.

"Persons" are deprived of the right to vote, the right to own property, and other rights. According to the draft law, for example, citizens "are under the protection and patronage of the state," but this is not said of "persons." Who protects these people? It is not clear. Or another example. Citizens have the right to freely choose their place of residence within the territory of Latvia, while "persons" merely have the right to "free movement." That is, some sort of pale of settlement is being introduced with regard to them.

It is perfectly possible to understand the sensible People's Front deputies who suggested not being in a hurry to adopt the law. For it will be impossible to alter it conceptually after adopting it on the first reading, and the legislative "mines" that have been laid could destroy overnight the already fragile stability in Latvian society. The law essentially confirms what hitherto was said by various figures not vested with power: Some people in Latvia will receive greater rights, others fewer rights, and a retroactive "deprivation of rights" will occur—which is quite discriminatory.

Alas, in the absence of the opposition the law was adopted on its first reading. IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked representatives of both factions to comment.

Aivars Endzins, leader of the People's Front faction working group:

"The 'Fundamental Law for the Transitional Period' is an important step along the path to independence and the realization of the will of the majority of the people of Latvia expressed at the time of the 3 March poll this year. The people said clearly and distinctly that they want to live in an independent, democratic Latvia. The new law is essentially a constitution of a fully independent state. The draft resolution on the law's validation provides for the repeal of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Constitution and also deems invalid on the territory of Latvia the USSR Constitution and laws and various normative acts.

"Yes, the idea of citizenship is enshrined in the law. But no state can exist without such an institution. And it is obvious that the status of persons without citizenship in any state differs from the legal status of citizens."

Stanislav Buka, deputy for the "Equal Rights" faction:

"In our view, a document with a manifestly apartheid thrust has been adopted. Mindful of the kind of filter enshrined in the draft laws on citizenship which have been prepared, it is now possible to say definitely that the new state has taken quite a different path from the declared one, not a democratic path. The inequality, the inequality of rights, of Latvia's inhabitants is essentially enshrined constitutionally. On the constitutional level the opposition is debarred from decisionmaking in the Supreme Soviet—another step back, away from the democratic tradition.

"The total rejection of the USSR's legislative and constitutional systems—this is the difference between the document and last year's declaration of independence—is a blow at the Council of Ministers, which is trying to establish socioeconomic relations with the USSR as a lifeline for Latvia. And the final point—the document clearly denotes a new spiral of confrontation in Latvia."

Baltic Council Session Begins in Jurmala

LD2806103191 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 28 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Jurmala June 28 TASS—A regular meeting of the Baltic Council began here today. The leaders of the Three Baltic republics intend to discuss principles for economic relations with the centre.

Latvia's stand incorporates a number of proposals, Deputy Prime Minister Arnis Kalnins told TASS. The republic considers it advisable to make mutual settlements on a clearing basis and participate in specific federal programmes to boost the production of oil, coal and gas.

Representatives of Latvia could be included as observers in the Central Board of the USSR State Bank and the currency committee, Kalnins said.

The republic also expresses readiness to assume customs control duties. The deputy premier does not share apprehensions that there may arise complexities in relationships between "the nine" and "the six".

RSFSR

Government Condemns OMON's Vilnius Provocation

LD2706125291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] According to a report from the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY, a high-ranking representative of the Russian Government has described the action of the Vilnius OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] as a provocation with far-reaching aims. In his opinion, this action was purposely arranged on the eve of the working meeting between President Gorbachev and the Group of Seven in London and on the eve of Yeltsin taking up the post of president of Russia. It is the aim of those who are behind the Vilnius OMON members, the representative of the Russian Government believes, to provoke the Russian leadership into making a harsh statement addressed to the center, on the one hand, in order to accuse Yeltsin of disregarding the interests of the Russian-speaking population, and on the other hand to cause a conflict between Yeltsin and Gorbachev yet again.

I will remind you that we are talking about the seizure at 1630 on 26 June of the Vilnius telephone exchange by the OMON. At 1900, according to a report from a staff member of Lithuania's permanent representation in Moscow, the OMON vacated the exchange. A member of the permanent representation quoted General Gromov, deputy minister of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, to the effect that the OMON acted with the sanction of Petrauskas, the procurator of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Tatarstan President Views Union Treaty Signing

LD2706130991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 27 Jun 91

[by TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—Mintimer Shaymiyev, president of the Republic of Tatarstan, intends to meet with Russian President Boris Yeltsin in the near future to settle the matter of Tatarstan signing the Union treaty.

"Tatarstan will not drag out these talks," Mintimer Shaymiyev stated in a telephone conversation with a TASS correspondent.

As is known, the Supreme Soviet of this former autonomous republic within the Russian Federation adopted a decision to sign the Union treaty independently.

Announcing that preparatory work is under way for the meeting of the leaders of Tatarstan and Russia, Mintimer Shaymiyev stressed that "any compromise decision on this matter can be found only within the limitations of Tatarstan's independent signing of the Union treaty."

In the words of Mintimer Shaymiyev, Tatarstan's position "is not the main obstacle" to the signing of the Union treaty.

27 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

LD2706200691

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1840 GMT on 27 June, in its regular "At the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet" program, begins carrying recorded highlights of the proceedings of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow on 27 June. Khasbulatov is chairing the session.

Khasbulatov announces that Deputy Shakhray will speak on behalf of the Committee on Legislation about the draft law on the RSFSR president. Shakhray reads out the articles of the draft law, defining the president's powers and status, and the limits placed on his power. The law includes a system of checks and balances to ensure that the president's power does not prevail over the authority of the Supreme Soviet. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet will determine the salaries of the president and vice president. A special service will protect these two officials. Shakray concludes by saying that the Committee on Legislation asks the Supreme Soviet to pass the law quickly, since it is so uncomplicated.

At 1848 GMT Shakhray answers deputies' questions about the draft law. One deputy compares the proposed salaries of the RSFSR president and vice president with those of U.S. Congress officials.

A deputy then sets out his views on the proposed salaries of the RSFSR president and vice president.

At 1856 GMT Khasbulatov puts the draft law to the vote. It is carried.

At 1857 GMT A screen caption reads "Afternoon Session."

Boris Andreyevich Zolutukhin speaks about the draft RSFSR law on a republican constitutional court. He says that there are many proposed amendments and specifies how many amendments relate to each article in the law. Deputy Stepankov then speaks about the value of a constitutional court: it could save the Procuracy many hours of work in dealing with complaints from citizens. Khasbulatov puts several articles of the draft law to the vote.

At 1905 GMT a screen caption reads: "Evening Session."

Zolutukhin continues to take deputies through the various amendments. Deputies speak briefly on each amendment, and Khasbulatov puts each one to the vote.

At 1907 GMT Khasbulatov asks deputies to vote on the draft law in principle, taking account of all the amendments. The draft law is passed by both chambers.

Presidential Inauguration Bill Passed

LD2706153491 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Report by TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—The president of the Russian Federation will be inaugurated no later than one month after the official announcement of election results, according to a presidential inauguration bill passed by the Russian parliament today.

Boris Yeltsin won Russia's first presidential election held on June 12.

Under the bill, the Russian president shall be sworn in at an inaugural meeting of the highest body of state power.

Boris Yeltsin will be sworn in at the Fifth Extraordinary Congress of Russian People's Deputies, scheduled to begin in Moscow on July 10.

Under the law, the president and vice-president will assume their duties after the inauguration.

The Republican Council of Ministers will lay down its powers no later than ten days after inauguration and will serve as a caretaker before the new cabinet is formed.

The president will be paid 4,000 roubles (about 160 U.S. dollars at the tourist exchange rate) a month and vice-president—3,200 roubles—more than any other government official in the Republic.

A special service will protect the president and vice-president and their families.

The bill enters into force immediately.

President's Salary Approved

LD2706105691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1000 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Our parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Korablev continues to report on the work of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet.

[Korablev] At the joint session of the two chambers of the Russian parliament today four draft laws are being examined—on amendments to the draft law on the RSFSR Constitutional Court, which was tabled by people's deputies at the fourth congress; on candidates for office in the Constitutional Court; and on medical insurance for citizens of the republic. The session began, however, with a discussion on the draft law of the republic on the president of the Russian Federation assuming office. There are 10 articles in this rather laconic act of legislation which define the Russian president assuming office, his swearing-in before the people at a solemn session of the supreme body of power of the Russian Federation, the divestment of the Council of Minister's powers to the newly elected president, and also the Supreme Soviet's determination of the salaries for the president and vice president of the Russian Federation. Regarding this article of the law, I would like to point out that during discussions the deputies voted in favor of setting the salary of the Russian Federation president at 4,000 rubles a month, and that of the vice president at 3,200 rubles a month. Finally, Article 9 of the law says that the place of domicile of the president is the city of Moscow, the capital of the RSFSR.

The deputies approved this document by a majority vote and the law comes into force from the moment it is adopted: that is, today.

The Supreme Soviet members are now examining amendments to the RSFSR law on the republican constitutional court. There are about 200 amendments and all of them are fundamental, so deputies have a great deal of intensive work before them.

There I end my report from the House of the Soviets on Krasnpresnenskaya Naberezhnaya, where the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is in session.

Novosibirsk Assails Gorbachev, Polozkov

LD2706182191 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Novosibirsk June 27 TASS—The joint plenary meeting of the Novosibirsk territorial and city committees of the communist party demanded the convocation of an extraordinary congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Participants in the plenum accused the party leadership, led by Mikhail Gorbachev, of "inconsistency", and the leadership of the Russian Federation Communist Party (Ivan Polozkov) of "political mistakes and weaknesses".

"The course of a radical renewal of socialism has been replaced with an increasing slide into capitalism," the plenary meeting said in a statement. "Destructive processes are mounting in the country, total chaos in the economy and the collapse of statehood cannot be ruled out".

The current resolution of the plenary meeting in Novosibirsk continues a series of protests by Siberian party organisations against the current political course of the Soviet leadership.

Last week heads of eleven major party organisations of the region published a similar statement in the press of Siberian cities.

'Fifth Wheel' Roundup of Yeltsin's U.S. Trip

LD2606091191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1935 GMT on 25 June carries the 90-minute "Fifth Wheel" program, which focusses on RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin's recent trip to the United States. Presenter Bella Kurkova begins by recalling the Russian sovereignty declaration of 12 June 1990 and hails efforts by the Russian leadership to resist pressure from the center and goes on to note the Nine plus One agreement and Yeltsin's election on 12 June this year.

In a section captioned "Foreword to Visit," Kurkova recalls Richard Nixon's visit to Russia during the third Russian Congress of People's Deputies. Video shows Yeltsin speaking at that time about the need for democratization and saying that there can be no return to the past.

Next, Yeltsin is shown embarking for the United States at Vnukovo on 18 June. Next, the presenter interviewed Yeltsin on board the airplaine on his thought as he sets off for the United States (see referent item). Yeltsin says he is using the invitation to build political bridges and look for joint programs on a mutually beneficial basis, in such fields as aviation, environment-friendly car engines, banks, agricultural processing and storage, and conversion of military industry. He says Russia has embarked on the road to democracy.

Kurkova asks about the Novo-Ogarevo meeting the day before his flight. Yeltsin says not all articles of the draft Union treaty have been agreed, but it has been sent to the republics' parliaments for discussion before final agreement. He says the Novo-Ogarevo talks have become easier since his election.

Yeltsin then talks about his plans since his election. His first decree will be on higher education. Kurkova notes how much travelling Yeltsin has done around Russia. Yeltsin says this means that he knows the situation in the country well.

Next, Yeltsin is shown arriving in the United States. Kurkova now talks on the airplane to Vladimir Lukin, chairman of a Russian Supreme Soviet committee, about the importance of the visit. He looks forward to Yeltsin's meetings with U.S. leaders.

Above a caption stating "Start of the visit, Washington, evening of 18 June," Yeltsin is shown making an arrival statement to crowds of newsmen and subsequently speaking at a reception in the Soviet Embassy.

Kurkova goes on to quote the NEW YORK TIMES on congressional enthusiasm for Yeltsin.

Next, Yeltsin is shown speaking at a meeting with congressional leaders. He thanks them for the invitation, praises the Congress experience of democracy, and describes his election by secret ballot as an event whose importance reaches far beyond Russia.

Yeltsin ends his speech and shows a painting presented to Congress by the Russian leadership.

Following a scheduled break for a "Vesti" newscast, Kurkova quotes THE LOS ANGELES TIMES on Yeltsin's reception in Congress. Yeltsin is shown speaking briefly to congressmen and trying on a stetson hat and belt presented by Dole.

Other U.S. press comment is cited on Yeltsin's visit: THE NEW YORK TIMES on his visit to the Lincoln memorial and THE WASHINGTON POST on popular enthusiasm.

Following a caption that states "American Red Cross, 19 June, meeting with AFL-CIO," Yeltsin is shown speaking at an AFL-CIO meeting, calling for trade unions to occupy their proper place in society. The audience applauds and cheers.

Next, Yeltsin is shown receiving the international democracy award at the Center for Democracy, shaking hands with Vice President Quayle, and delivering an acceptance speech. Quayle is also shown speaking at ceremony.

Yeltsin is then shown being received at the Pentagon by an honor guard and interviewed briefly by a crowd of newsmen outside.

The next scene shows the White House with Yeltsin and Bush walking out to address newsmen in the White House garden. Bush speaks of his pleasure at welcoming Yeltsin to the White House and tells journalists about the content of their talks. Yeltsin is also shown speaking, thanking Bush for the meeting, and talking about Russia's policies.

Yeltsin is also shown speaking at New York University, wearing a baseball cap posing for the cameras.

Kurkova, standing on an American city street, interviews Viktor Yugin, chairman of a Russian Supreme Soviet committee. Yugin complains about the weather and comments favorably on Yeltsin's activities during his U.S. tour.

Kurkova, now sitting in a lounge, then interviews Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev on the fruits of Yeltsin's talks in the United States. Kozyrev praises the respectful attitude shown to Yeltsin in the United States and speaks highly of the congressional attitudes to him.

Kozyrev repeats Yeltsin's views that the aim was not to come with hands held out for credits, but to seek cooperation. The credit of trust is more important than financial credits, he says.

Above the caption "Return Home," Kurkova, sitting in an airport departure lounge, interviews Gennadiy Burbulis, an aide to Yeltsin. Barbulis describes the U.S. tour as a collective achievement of all the Russian people, for it was they who elected Yeltsin as president. He points out that no time was wasted on sightseeing; it was all spent on intensive talks.

Finally, Yeltsin is shown boarding an airplaine and landing back in Moscow, where he is met by Khasbulatov, Rutskoy, and others.

Yeltsin Backed by Defense Industry Workers

PM2606090791 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 91 p 1

[Ye. Panov article: "Military-Industrial Complex Voted for Yeltsin. Another View on the Ballot Results"]

[Text] According to the Leningrad City Soviet Commission for the Military-Industrial Complex and Conversion, approximately 650,000 people work at defense plants around the city. About another 300,000 work in organizations which are not directly part of the defense complex but which fulfill military orders. Leningrad is the only major city with enterprises from all defense ministries. And if you include scientific institutes, the concentration of facilities serving the military-industrial complex is greater here than anywhere else. A simple calculation reveals that around 1 million people are employed in them. Add to the direct employees the members of their families, and we find that one in two Leningraders has connections of one sort or another with the military-industrial complex and that the vital interests of half of the city's inhabitants depend on conversion—its success or, conversely, its failure.

On the basis of various data, which are understated rather than overstated, it can be supposed that a similar correlation is also characteristic of Russia as a whole: Half its population is linked to the field of reforms precisely through the conversion process. Therefore the preferences of people involved in the "defense sector" had a decisive influence on the overall results. So the candidates for the post of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president attempted to play the "military-industrial complex card" skillfully.

In fact, two candidates played this card—Yeltsin and Ryzhkov. And they played it in completely different ways. Yeltsin's program, in brief, presupposes conversion via the market. It is a difficult path, but it is probably the only one which gives people the chance of a new life. Ryzhkov (analysts were unanimous that he is a "military-industrial complex man") would certainly have handled the matter in the same way as when he was head of the government. This path stood no chance of success, on the contrary, it guaranteed stagnation and the speedy deterioration of the defense sectors. Obviously, there were supporters of both the first and second paths among their millions of workers. In theory, Ryzhkov was supported by the military, the civilian and scientific generals, and the upper strata of the bureaucracy. Yeltsin was supported by intellectuals, professionals, and competent specialists and workers—that is, the most educated, dynamic, competitive part of the military-industrial complex "personnel," the chief ingredient in its total potential, people who do not fear the market and link to reform the realization of their personal expectations.

Nobody knows how each of these groups voted, but it is absolutely clear how the military-industrial complex as a whole cast its vote. It supported Yeltsin, which means it supports conversion via the market.

As we noted, Leningrad—a city unique in terms of the concentration of defense enterprises and the breadth of their spectrum—gave Yeltsin over 67 percent of its votes.

The Volga region: Nizhniy Novgorod and Samara Oblasts gave him almost 70 percent of the vote.

The Ural Region: Sverdlovsk Oblast—over 84 percent; Chelyabinsk—over 77 percent; Udmurtia—52 percent. Unofficial figures from the Ural "nuclear" cities indicate an undisputed preference for Yeltsin.

The military-industrial complex facilities scattered across Siberia also brought him victory—in Novosibirsk, Omsk, and Tomsk Oblasts, and also in Krasnodar Kray. It is interesting that the inhabitants of the Krasnoyarsk "closed zones" were almost unanimous in their choice.

The European part of Russia: Here Yeltsin won the support of the arms workers of Tula and the workers in the numerous defense enterprises in Kaluga and Voronezh.

The results of the expression of the people's will in Moscow Oblast are indicative. Here Boris Nikolayevich collected over 62 percent of the vote. Missile workers in Kaliningrad, aviation workers in Zhukovskiy, electronics workers in Fryazin, and optical workers in Krasnogorsk expressed unequivocal support for him. He won convincing victories in such well known strongholds of the military-industrial complex as Mytishchi, Reutovo, Khimki, Lytkarino, and Shchelkovo. The average result in these areas hovered around 70 percent.

Let us look at the Moscow region's scientific cities—Troitsk, Pushchino, Dubna, Dolgoprudnyy, Chernogolovka, and Protvino. Of course, you cannot say that they directly belong to the military-industrial complex, but it cannot be denied that specialists at the leading edge of science are involved in defense problems. Thus the scientific elite resolutely opted for a reform program. The physicists of Troitsk, for example, gave Yeltsin over 74 percent of the vote, while their colleagues in Protvino gave him 72 percent, and the biologists of Pushchino gave him over 67 percent.

The conclusion: The workers of the military-industrial complex, skilled specialists, and intellectual elite of Russia are ready for market reform. We need a mechanism which can launch it in the near future. Otherwise expectations will collapse under their own weight.

Silayev Claims Success in Anti-Crisis Debate

LD2706135591 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] In a detailed discussion of the anti-crisis program, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has accepted many of Russia's principal conditions, according to Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev. This is first of all the transfer of foreign economic activity to the republics, placing state orders through republican structures. The document also says that the leading plants should be placed under republican jurisdication in the third quarter of the year.

At the same time Silayev said the Russian Government still has objections, and the main of these concerns the formation of a Union budget.

Silayev Chairs 'Brainstorming Session' on Market

PM2606133991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 91 p 1

[Yelizaveta Leontyeva report: "Brainstorming in Arkhangelsk"]

[Text] The first working conference on the implementation of the Russian economic program has been held. These will now be held weekly.

Dacha No. 6 at the "Arkhangelskoye" holiday center became famous because Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and his team worked here on the 500 days program. A photograph of him and next to it a photograph of Yeltsin are still up on the wall on the ground floor of this small wooden house. When the program lost momentum, immediately the names of Shatalin and Gorbachev which had been "added" to it disappeared.... Now it remains what it was at the very beginning—Yavlinskiy's program. But now it exists only in the form of a historical fact.

The new Russian program bears the title "Yeltsin-Silayev." And of course no one wants us to start with new titles and new programs for the umpteenth time. Apathy has already run so deep in society that we are faced with a real threat of indifference to all decisions, laws, and other ventures that emerge "at the top."

Not only the elaborators, but also a large group of well known economists, each of whom has a different approach to the problem of Russia's transition to the market, came to Dacha No. 6, where, after Yavlinskiy's program, the Russian program was born. They included Soltan Dzarasov, Larisa Piyasheva, Pavel Medvedev, Igor Nit, Boris Pinsker, Aleksandr Granberg, Viktor Volkonskiy, and a number of other names. Admittedly the differences in viewpoints did not prevent them from discussing the section in the program that concerns the privatization and destatization of the economy. As one of those present said, the people gathered here are believers, so there is no point in wasting time proving that God exists.

The "brainstorming session"—as Ivan Silayev, who chaired the conference, called it—is to become a tradition. He quickly diverted arguments into a calm businesslike channel before they could flare up. Dzarasov, for example, maintained that an all-out assault is dangerous when it comes to privatization. And Piyasheva stated equally resolutely that if Silayev carries out a massive reform of ownership in a short time, he will become a Russian Erhard. And that this historic step should not be missed. Meanwhile the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers proposed that everyone reflect on the mechanism of rapid privatization—as this is contained in the program. There were many proposals, and presumably they will be fleshed out in concrete decisions in the form of a final document from the "brainstorming session."

You cannot help being pleased that the program is gaining "intellectual muscle." Boris Yeltsin was the first to issue a rallying cry to the economic elite by forming a consultative-coordination council under him. Many well known people joined it, some of them quitting familiar posts in the entourage of the Union president and prime minister. The Russian Council of Ministers is now also taking this path.

Answering my question about when we can expect real returns from the clarification work on the program, Ivan Stepanovich said that the time for concrete actions has come and that everything that is now being done is detailed preparation for the upcoming Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

The visiting journalists had many questions for Yevgeniy Saburov, the leader of the group drawing up the program. They asked the most questions about who he would like to see head the new Cabinet of Ministers. "Silayev," he answered briefly and clearly. "What about Skokov?" "Absolutely not." "Lobov?" "I have not yet formed an opinion of him." "Maybe Bocharov?" "Impossible...."

There were also questions about the subject of the subsequent working meeting, which will most probably take place next Wednesday [26 June]. Ivan Silayev named the weak points in the program on which thorough work must be done. These are conversion and the market, scientific-technical programs and the market, and also agrarian policy. Apart from that, credit and financial policy is still provoking many questions, too. Igor Nit, advisor to the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, said that it must not on any account be left in the hands of the center. Of course, money is politically safer than tanks. But it can crush you just like a tank.

Silayev, FRG Delegation View Political Prospects

PM2706105191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 25 Jun 91 p 1

[Vitaliy Buzuyev report: "Via Repentance to Cooperation"]

[Text] The 50th anniversary of the USSR's entry into the Great Patriotic War against fascist Germany was the reason for the visit to our country by a government delegation from North Rhine-Westphalia. Together with his colleagues, H. Schnoor, this land's vice prime minister, visited Belorussia and took part in laying the foundation of an international youth center (it will be built with FRG financial assistance) and visited the "Khatyn" memorial complex. Yesterday the German delegation met with Russian Prime Minister I. Silayev.

Speaking about his impressions of his visit to the USSR during a friendly dialogue with I. Silayev, H. Schnoor cited the following example. During a visit to the Lyublino cemetery, where Germans who died during the last war are buried, he noticed two women laying flowers on the tombs of German prisoners of war. He greatly appreciated this fact since he is perfectly well aware of the suffering and grief that fascism inflicted on the Soviet Union.

"However," H. Schnoor said, "innocent people were also drawn into the abyss of war. Fascism also inflicted considerable suffering on the German people."

Russian Prime Minister I. Silayev stressed that today it is necessary to rise above the grievances that the war left behind in the hearts of two great peoples. The example cited by Mr. Schnoor confirms that ordinary people have a truly statesmanlike approach.

The German guests were of course interested in the prospects of the new draft Union treaty under discussion in Novo-Ogarevo.

The Russian Government is inspired by recent events in the Union parliament. In I. Silayev's opinion, M. Gorbachev delivered a brilliant speech to deputies confirming his commitment to radical economic reform. The prospect of the signing of the Union treaty can, the premier reckons, also be regarded with optimism because Russia's democratic forces won a major victory 12 June. B. Yeltsin's election victory not only shows that most voters are sympathetic toward him as an individual. It is important that Russians also reacted positively to the Russian Government's course of radical economic reform.

Among the major problems facing the Russian Government is the executive's weakness at local level. In some areas there is overt opposition to the policy pursued by the RSFSR Council of Ministers. What is the solution to this? The only one is for the top city official to be elected openly, as has happened in Moscow and Leningrad, for instance. If that happens at local level, in the boondocks, it will be possible to overcome a certain lack of receptivity to innovation.

Mr. Schnoor pointed out that similar processes are also taking place in East Germany. There, too, it is hard to create the foundations of a strong executive. It is not only a matter of finance. Although that, too, is a problem. Above all people themselves must grow accustomed to the fact that no one can improve the situation apart from their region's executive. If the authorities cannot cope, they should be reelected.

The German delegation head stressed that the whole world is looking at Russia today. All the republics and the center's policy depend on Russia today. What is more, the situation in Eastern Europe also depends on Russia. Therefore the Russian Government's efforts to create strong institutions of executive power can only be welcomed. An example is needed on which others can rely.

Disclosing future plans, I. Silayev informed his guest that this year a republic budget making it possible to leave a large proportion of revenue in the areas where it is directly created will begin to be formed. A federal support fund is also envisaged to ease the transition to the market in some regions of the republic that are in an unequal position vis-a-vis other regions.

Bashkir Supreme Soviet Approves Union Treaty

PM2606142791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Aleksandr Zinovyev: "Draft Union Treaty Approved"]

[Text] Ufa—The Bashkir SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has discussed the draft treaty on the union of sovereign states sent to the republic's parliament by the USSR president.

Supreme Soviet Chairman M. Rakhimov briefed deputies on the progress of the work on this document in Novo-Ogarevo. The deputies, each of whom had received a copy of the draft the previous day, noted with satisfaction that according to this document the Bashkir SSR is an independent and equal subject of the USSR, and its relations with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] are defined by the treaty between them. At the same time note was taken of the need to further coordinate with the republics a number of articles in the draft treaty on the union of sovereign states with a view to rigorously ensuring the equal rights of the founders and subjects of the USSR.

In an adopted resolution the Bashkir SSR Supreme Soviet approved the draft treaty in the main. M. Rakhimov, chairman of the Bashkir SSR Supreme Soviet and leader of the Bashkir SSR plenipotentiary delegation formed by the republic Supreme Soviet, was entrusted with signing it on behalf of the Bashkir SSR. The Bashkir SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers were entrusted with submitting to the Bashkir SSR Supreme Soviet in August of this year the draft treaty of the Bashkir SSR with the RSFSR, defining the Bashkir SSR's relations with the RSFSR in accordance with the Bashkir SSR's declaration of sovereignty.

Sobchak Comments on Leningrad Situation, Economy

OW2706042191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a Wednesday ceremony in the White Hall of the Leningrad City Council (LenSoviet), Anatoliy Sobchak was inaugurated as Mayor, and Vyacheslav Shchebakov as Vice Mayor of Leningrad.

Mr. Sobchak made a speech, in which he said he considered it his major task to contribute to restoring the former cultural, political, economic and spiritual potential of St. Petersburg-Leningrad in full.

Addressing a news conference later in the day, he said restoring the city's original name, St. Petersburg, would be sure to encourage most citizens to redouble their efforts to restore their city's glory and grandeur. According to Sobchak, the renaming campaign should cover a number of stages and, far from undermining the city's budget, should be expected to bring considerable revenues. Commenting on the stand adopted by the campaign's opponents he described their actions as "speculation" and themselves as "followers of the country's totalitarian leaders who have for 70 years been showing Vladimir Ulyanov's body to the public instead of burying it in accordance with the widely accepted procedure."

Asked by IF [INTERFAX] to comment on the present political situation in the country, Anatoliy Sobchak said the Novo-Ogarevo process was having a favorable effect on society. He welcomed the results of the recent presidential election in Russia, and suggested President Gorbachev should envigorate his dialogue with the republics, sign the new Union Treaty, and accept the economic reform program prepared by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy.

Communist Party Politburo To Convene Plenum

PM2606093591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo"]

[Excerpts] A routine RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Politburo sitting examined a series of topical questions relating to party work.

N.M. Kiselev, first secretary of Kursk Oblast's Kurchatov Party Gorkom [City Committee], reported on the practical work of cooperation between the city committee and soviets of people's deputies. [passage omitted]

The Politburo generalized and thoroughly analyzed proposals regarding the Russian party organization's strategy and tactics, along with the critical comments directed at [RSFSR] Communist Party and CPSU executive organs during the conference of republic, kray, and oblast party committee first secretaries. All Politburo members taking part in the sitting spoke on this issue.

Practical steps were outlined to define clear program directives and organizational basis for the activity of the Communist Party and to implement a course in the interests of working people which takes socioeconomic and political realities into consideration.

It was decided to promptly convene a Central Committee plenum to discuss the question of the Communist Party's political position and tactics. It is intended to ensure that thorough preparations are made for this plenum with the participation of Central Committee members and party committee first secretaries, to hold meetings and consultations at the local level with the party aktiv, Communist workers, peasants, leaders, specialists at enterprises, and the intelligentsia, and to give Central Committee members a chance to study the draft documents beforehand.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo backed the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee's stance on the question of the name of the future Union federation. Other questions relating to party life within the RSFSR Communist Party were examined.

Russia in Direct Wheat Purchase Deal With Canada

PM2606151991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 91 p 1

[Lev Aksenov report: "Canada Sells Wheat to Russia. As Usual. It Is Unusual That Russia Is Now Buying It Without Going Through The Center"]

[Text] Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, received William Smith, chairman of the Canadian Wheat Committee, in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] House of the Soviets on Thursday 20 June.

According to Leonid Cheshinskiy, Russian minister of grain products, who participated in the meeting, this was the first time that Russia and Canada had embarked on direct ties in grain trade. Earlier, all these operations went through the Union center. However, since this year the USSR Government has bought significantly smaller volumes of grain than before, Cheshinskiy said, the needs of the processing industry, and consequently of the supply of the most important food products to the population, would not be met, so Russia was forced to make autonomous purchases of additional grain consignments.

In these conditions, according to the minister, the credit from Canada to the tune of 500 million U.S. dollars granted to the Russian Federation was of great significance. These funds were sufficient to acquire 4.5 million tonnes of grain. "These purchases have enabled us to avoid near-famine, since they covered approximately three months' worth of the republic population's need for flour," Cheshinskiy admitted. Deliveries were made between December of last year and May of this year. The product supplied was of the highest quality and was an improvement on domestic agricultural produce and grain imported from other countries.

As for the price, it was "the lowest in the whole period since 1973," the Russian minister went on.

Questions concerning future cooperation in light of new approaches to questions of foreign economic ties were discussed at the meeting with the head of the RSFSR Government, Cheshinskiy reported. Henceforth Russia will establish such ties autonomously. Bearing in mind the fact that the Russian Federation is a major grain importer at present, "we are interested in establishing direct contacts with suppliers so that we can make grain purchases in a planned way without any interruptions." This, naturally, also affects market conditions, and leads to a considerable reduction of prices for imported grain. "The point is that now, when U.S. President George Bush has announced that the USSR will be granted a credit to the tune of $1.5 billion, the price went up sharply literally within a single day. As a result, one tonne of feed wheat, which used to cost $85, will now cost $95. It is not hard to calculate what this will cost when you buy 10 million tonnes," Cheshinskiy added.

Long-term ties are convenient for the suppliers, too, the RSFSR minister noted, since "they will be geared to a specific volume of production." At the same time, deliveries will be effected at a steady pace, "without any disruptions." The Canadians are also interested in reliable permanent partners.

The Canadian Wheat Committee is a state corporation, and the aim of its activity is to assist private farmers in grain sales, including export. The committee, which was established in 1935, possesses a monopoly on the export of wheat, oats, and barley. As far as feed grain is concerned, it is sold by private companies.

RSFSR Bodies Appeal for Harvest Aid

PM2706123191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Appeal from RSFSR bodies: "We Call You to the Harvest Work: Appeal to All Workers in the Agro-Industrial Complex and Inhabitants of the RSFSR Cities and Industrial Centers"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

The situation with regard to providing the republic's population with food this year is causing alarm. The continuing decline of the population of large horned cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry and the reduction in the volumes of production and procurements of agricultural output are emptying the store shelves as never before. In many respects this is the result of errors of last year, when under the difficult weather conditions peasants were essentially left to face their problems and did not receive the necessary aid from the state or society. That should not be repeated. The way out of the situation which has taken shape lies in increasing production output on kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], the subsidiary farms of citizens, enterprises, and organizations, and individual farms. For this they must primarily have a sufficient quantity of high-quality feed.

Unfortunately so far not everyone yet acknowledges in depth the fact that the buildup of meat and milk production, the stabilization of the food market, and ultimately the mood and well-being of all the republic's working people depend on the stability of the feed base.

Statistics bear out that in the first two 10-day periods of June throughout the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as a whole 2.5-3 times less hay, cured hay, and grass meal were cut and procured than over the

same period in previous years. The farms of the non-Chernozem zone and the Central Chernozem, Volga-Vyatka, and Volga regions are lagging particularly. Here they are letting slip the best time for procuring highly nutritious feed and opportunities for obtaining second cuttings of perennial grasses. At the same time a number of oblasts of the Urals and Siberia are experiencing a very harsh drought and are in need of special support.

In the situation which has taken shape the party, trade union, and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations, local soviets of people's deputies, agro-industrial unions, and economic leaders must mobilize all efforts and funds for the fulfillment of this very important state and political task. The center of all organizational and political work must be shifted to the feed procurement teams and links, and good conditions must be created for highly productive labor by people engaged in harvesting the grass and for the enhancement of their material and moral interest. The inhabitants of cities and workers' settlements, students, and enterprise and organization workers must be enlisted to feed procurement.

We ask workers, engineering and technical workers, and leaders of enterprises of the agricultural machine building, defense, and machine building complexes to respond and to mobilize, as has already happened more than once, to supply the countryside with the necessary aid in deliveries of agricultural equipment and spare parts. We are sure that the workers of the petrochemical complex will also deliver all necessary fuel and lubricants on time. Only in this way is it possible today to promptly eliminate the stoppages of thousands of feed harvesters.

We urge the local organs of power, kolkhoz members, sovkhoz workers, pensioners, young people, and the entire population wherever they may live—in the countryside or the city—and irrespectively of their membership of a particular party to put an end to the futile talk and meetings and to engage in the specific business of bringing in the harvest in order to resolve the main task—feeding our children, our old people, and the entire Russian people and avoiding the possible threat of famine.

Skillfully organized competition among feed procurement workers could play a large part here. The Komsomol must show its efficiency. People working in the meadows and feed fields have the right to expect a large amount of attention from the consumer cooperatives and the consumer services and health system.

We appeal to the population with its own plots. Get out your scythes, forks, and rakes and launch the procurement of feed for privately owned livestock, particularly in places unsuited to mechanical harvesting. Remember that this feed will be very useful to you in winter.

Communists, members of trade unions, representatives of other parties and associations, working people in cities and workers' settlements, render the necessary aid, comrades, to the countryside in bringing in the green harvest, without you the rural inhabitants cannot manage today!

Today too in this hard period of harvest toil, may our people have a good working mood like the one they have had down the centuries during the haymaking!

[signed] The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee; the RSFSR Agrarian Union; the Central Committee of the RSFSR trade union of workers in the agro-industrial complex; the Central Committee of the RSFSR trade union of transport and road workers; the Central Committee of the RSFSR trade union of workers in the chemical sectors of industry; the Central Committee of the RSFSR trade union of heavy machine building workers; the Central Committee of the RSFSR trade union of workers in trade, public catering, and consumer cooperatives.

Western Republics

More Economic Power for Belorussia Government

LD2706172991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] The republican parliament has granted the Belorussian Government additional powers for the period of transition to the market up to 1993. From now on the republican Council of Ministers will be able to promptly respond to actions of those partners who fail to comply with bilateral accords on deliveries and to protect the interests of enterprises. The government was granted, the right to issue licenses and establish quotas for exporting the output produced on the territory of the republic regardless of the enterprise's departmental subordination.

A decision was adopted to the effect that all the enterprises and organizations in union subordination on republican territory are under the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic's jurisdiction. In accordance with the document, decisions of union bodies on the destatization and privatization of property of the state enterprises and organizations in union subordination situated on republican territory, if adopted without prior agreement with the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, have no legal force and are not enforceable.

Belorussian Party on Meaning of 'USSR'

PM2606150191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Position of the Belorussian Communist Party [CP] Central Committee on the Question of the Name of the Future Union Federation"]

[Text] As we know, the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies examined the question "On the Name of the Soviet State" and by a majority of votes (following a roll call) adopted a decision to preserve the USSR's

current name —The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The congress advocated the integrity of the country and its former name, stressing that they are the product of the historical community of the Soviet peoples and the links existing between them.

In line with a decision by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, this question was submitted to a nationwide ballot (referendum). A USSR Supreme Soviet resolution stipulated that the voting paper in the secret ballot should carry the following wording: "Do you consider it necessary to preserve the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which the rights and freedoms of individuals of all nationalities will be fully guaranteed?" The results of the referendum are already known: 76.4 percent of those who participated in the referendum—the overwhelming majority of the country's citizens—supported the integrity and future development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Over 5 million citizens in the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic also expressed their will firmly: 82.7 percent of those who took part in the referendum voted to preserve the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In this context, confusion has arisen over the position of the preparatory committee to complete the work on the draft of the new Union treaty, which presupposes a new name for the future federation—the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics, omitting the word "Socialist." A strange argument emerges by way of an objection: This word is supposedly an "ideological symbol" and nothing like it exists in the names of other countries of the world.

For all intents and purposes, the preparatory committee ignored the decision of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies as the supreme organ of state power in the country, and it also ignored the results of the nationwide referendum—in other words, the will of the Soviet people.

This fact prompted a wave of reaction toward the party and Soviet organs of the republic, expressing irate indignation and resolute protest by Communists and the majority of workers in Belorussia.

Assuming that the question on the name of the state is of fundamental importance and that nobody but the people themselves are entitled to take historical responsibility for the future development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, by way of expressing disagreement with the position of the preparatory committee to complete the work on the draft of the new Union treaty, supporting the numerous demands by the republic's Communists and workers, and decisively refuting all efforts to act contrary to the will of the people, the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau resolves:

To appeal to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR, with the proposal that all necessary measures be taken to act in line with the free expression of the will of the peoples in our multinational fatherland and preserve the name of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which brings together the values of the historical past and outlines the future sociopolitical structure of our state.

The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau urges the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to initiate activity in support of the Soviet people's will, as expressed via the USSR referendum, which favors a renewed Union Federation under the name of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Through the medium of organizational, ideological, and propaganda work, and through the party press, to rouse Communists to the defense of the socialist choice of the people, and to resolutely rebuff the efforts by individual political groups and their leaders to change the political course of our state's development.

Clash at Ukraine Supreme Soviet Reported

OW2806043591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The attempts of demonstrators to enter the building of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, where the discussion of the draft Union treaty had begun, ended in clashes with the militia. Thousands of Kiev citizens and residents of other regions of the republic marched in columns in protest against the discussion of the draft treaty, believing that it was unacceptable for the republic. One of the columns was stopped by reinforced militia units near the Dinamo stadium.

Representatives of Narodnaya Rada, the official opposition of the Ukrainian parliament, said that the demonstration had been dispersed with clubs and tear gas. Among the victims there were several deputies.

The Ukrainian Ministry of Internal Affairs denied the fact of demonstrators being beaten. They said that the column had broken through the cordons and stopped. Several women fell, and the moving crowd could crush them. To prevent the tragedy, the militia used tear gas which was let out into the air, not at people, the ministry's officials said.

Ukraine Supreme Soviet Continues Debate

OW2706035091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In defiance of its own decision taken on Wednesday morning, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet returned on Wednesday evening to debates over the package of bills concerning the introduction of a presidency in the republic. The move followed the signing by 140 MPs [deputies] of an appeal urging the parliament to continue discussing these documents. Under the rules of procedure, the number of signatures was sufficient for

the resumption of debates. As a result, all the three bills, notably on the introduction of a presidency, the status of President of the Ukraine, and the election of a president, were passed in the first reading.

For the first time since his arrest last November, parliamentarian Stepan Khmara attended the parliamentary session on June 26. He said in an interview with IF [INTERFAX] that he feels insulted to be present in parliament which he once left under police guard, and that he came back only because of the discussion of the new Union treaty scheduled for Thursday.

The Presidium of the People's Rada (parliamentary opposition) discussed its tactics for tomorrow's sittings, and decided that the Raa would vote against the existing draft Union treaty if it were put to vote. According to the opposition, the draft differs very little from the previous one and restricts Ukrainian sovereignty.

Caucasus

Azerbaijan's Mutalibov on Future of Union

PM2706110091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Azerbaijan Republic President A.N. Mutalibov by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Sevruk—date, place not stated: "Sovereignty for the Sake of People"]

[Text] [Sevruk] What practical work is being done to implement the basic ideas of the joint statement of the Ten by the republic's parliament, the soviets at all levels, and also the republic's executive bodies?

[Mutalibov] The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium has approved the statement's provision directed primarily at improving the population's living standard. Although there is a widespread view that in Azerbaijan the people are tolerably well provided with everything they need, in fact this is not so. Suffice it to say that the income of inhabitants of our republic was much lower than the countrywide average.

We are already taking steps to eliminate this injustice. And I would like to divide this work into two parts—before and after the price reform. Being clearly aware that our republic, like the country as a whole, is on the brink of major economic transformations that will have a particularly adverse effect on the poorly protected strata of the population, we naturally wanted to adopt preemptive measures. Nearly 1 billion rubles [R] from Azerbaijan's budget, not counting the considerable funds of the labor collectives and sectors themselves, was assigned to increasing by at least one-third the wages of workers in culture, health care, and academic science institutions and the pensions of war and labor veterans, "Afghan" veterans, and others.

Today state, economic, and social organizations and enterprises are adopting real measures to soften the blow of the transitional period to the market and ensure social protection for people. Under a decision of many enterprises and organizations, minimum compensation levels were immediately increased to R100 or more. Protection measures include a discount on the cost of food in workers' cafeterias, the maintenance of the old prices for keeping children in kindergartens and for passes to departmental leisure homes, compensation for part of the cost of construction materials for people building individually, and others.

I will also mention something else that is worrying. Today, because of the severance of interrepublic and regional ties, the number of idle enterprises is growing. Azerbaijan, like everyone else, has begun to feel the negative results of this. And we in the republic are working intensively to fulfill our commitments under the economic agreement for 1991. But that, as you realize, is not enough. It is necessary for all components of the national economic complex to work efficiently and uninterruptedly, and in all regions of the country.

[Sevruk] Ayaz Niyazovich, the joint statement speaks of most-favored status for republics signing the Union treaty. What does this mean?

[Mutalibov] I believe that most-favored status means creating the most favorable conditions for the stabilization of the economic situation in those republics that are actively integrating within the common economic space which they themselves form, and then implementing certain foreign policy and foreign economic enactments to that end in conjunction with the other like-minded republics: concluding international treaties, contracts, and so forth.

[Sevruk] Does your republic have its own draft Union Treaty, and what provisions do you think should be added as amendments to the present draft?

[Mutalibov] A draft was submitted by the Azerbaijan delegation at talks on the Union treaty in August 1990. But life does not stand still, and the political situation in the country and the republic is changing rapidly.

Having clarified our positions on certain questions, we retained our commitment to the priorities proclaimed in the constitutional Law on the Sovereignty of the Azerbaijan Republic as regards political and economic autonomy and the independent resolution of all questions relating to our own development. Here it is important not to lose sight of the fact that we propose to stipulate in the treaty that the republics are the owners of the land, its resources, the maritime shelf, and other natural resources on their territory, and of state property located on their territory. Incidentally, let me note that some of this property may be transferred to the Union on a treaty basis for its use in the exercise of the powers vested in it. And facilities handed over jointly by several republics for operational management by the Union may be owned, on a share basis, by those republics.

Our vision of the future Union is like this: The Union should become a real federation of free and equal sovereign republics. Its cornerstone, in our view, should be the republics' common interests, which form an objective basis for their unification. This implies that no question that falls under the Union's jurisdiction can be resolved by a Union organ at its own discretion without taking the republics' opinions into account.

As for amendments, we have many of these to propose. I will dwell on the most important. We propose that it be stipulated that each republic party to the treaty retains in full its state sovereignty, manifested in the independent and autonomous exercise of supreme legislative, executive, and judicial power on its own territory. The state power of the Union of Sovereign Republics is exercised within the limits of the powers that the republics have assigned to their own joint jurisdiction, powers that must be exercised on a centralized basis in the common interests of all republics. Azerbaijan proposes that the republics be vested with the right autonomously to conclude agreements on international loans and credits.

We have also reaffirmed our position that only republics whose status has been raised to the level of Union republics may be components of the Union. The idea whereby a republic which forms part of another republic may become a member of the Union does not stand up to criticism, and entails the risk of serious domestic political complications for the Union republics. The republics should pledge to recognize existing borders, make no territorial claims, and not interfere in each other's internal affairs.

We propose that the powers of the Union would include only those questions that genuinely require the pooling of the republics' efforts—organizing the Armed Forces, determining the Union's socioeconomic strategy and foreign policy, and carrying out fundamental scientific research. In this context "powers of the Union" means powers exercised by the republics jointly within the framework of Union organs through the formulation of mutually agreed decisions.

In circumstances in which the Union would be the expression of the republics' genuinely common interests, the Union Supreme Soviet would have a unicameral structure and be made up of delegations from the republics, whose members would be elected in the republics parties to the treaty. Autonomous formations would also be represented on this Supreme Soviet, but their representatives should form part of the delegations of the republics, which would be more in keeping with the sovereign nature of the members of the Union. USSR Laws would be adopted by means of consensus among the republics' delegations in the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Sovereign Republics, by a majority of the votes of the total number of representatives of the republics in each delegation.

Thus we proceed on the basis that the renewed Union should be built on a basis of harmonious combination of the republics' interests, respect for their sovereign rights, and full participation in the life of the international community. Only this kind of intra-Union relations can overcome the centrifugal trends and act as a powerful incentive to membership of the Union.

That is our vision of the future Union, although I do not rule out the possibility that other approaches could exist.

[Sevruk] I think you will agree that the confrontation on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border and the continuing interethnic conflict are causing anxiety and grief throughout the country. Is it possible to bring events back to a course of reconciliation and mutually acceptable agreements?

[Mutalibov] I am often asked about this. In order to correctly understand my answer, it is necessary to go back to the prime sources and origins not of an interethnic conflict, as it is usually called, but of a political conflict based on the territorial claims of Armenia, which has dragged Azerbaijan into an undeclared war. Much has been said and said again about this war that Armenian guerrillas have been waging for more than three years now against the peaceful population exclusively on Azerbaijan's territory. I will not speak about it in detail: I am sure your readers know about it.

[Sevruk] But there is another view of the history and causes of the conflict. And it cannot be shrugged aside. An outsider can, they say, see things more clearly. Not fierce confrontation, but a softening of the sides' positions and their gradual rapprochement, a sensible compromise, will certainly help find a way to civil peace and good-neighborliness more quickly.

[Mutalibov] I only want to emphasize again that this war, imposed on us from outside, is political in nature. This is indicated eloquently by the fact that a new spiral of aggression against our sovereign republic began after the results of the referendum in Azerbaijan about the future of the Union became known.

The history of international relations provides irrefutable proof that as soon as the question of territorial claims arises anywhere, this virtually always leads to nationalist hysteria, the escalation of tension, and often open warfare.

It is therefore no accident that the entire civilized world lives and is guided by the fundamental principle of today—the inviolability of borders and respect for the legitimate rights and freedoms of all citizens.

In effect, today we are dealing with a gross violation, on Armenia's part, of the constitutional foundations of the USSR and the norms of international law. The fact that this practice has long persisted with impunity has already borne bitter fruit. And only now are measures being adopted to restore peace and the rule of law in the region.

But unfortunately that does not suit some people. This conflict is too convenient, as a sore on our country's body, for them to consent to its being healed so quickly.

Hence the fuss in certain circles about recent events in the region.

All this shows yet again that this conflict is largely artificial and imposed from outside. The Armenian leadership is trying in every way to ideologize the conflict, seeking to give it the character of a confrontation between, as they put it, "democrats" and Communists. This is a new and far-reaching element in the situation.

All the same, I am convinced that our peoples' natural intelligence and their historical memory will prevail over emotion; there is no alternative to good-neighborliness.

[Sevruk] As well as being president of Azerbaijan, you are head of the republic Communist Party. Does this fact influence you in setting your presidential course? In particular, how, in your policy, do you combine communist atheism and the commitment to Islam of the greater part of the population of Azerbaijan?

[Mutalibov] You know, these myths about Islamic fundamentalism and fanaticism in Azerbaijan are simply being fanned by certain people, not without malicious intent. If we are really Communists, then first and foremost we should see and study life in all its realities and contradictions. It is important to understand that Islam is not only, indeed not chiefly, a set of religious rituals. Islam is a huge stratum of history, a stratum of culture, an agglomeration of centuries-old traditions, a moral code, if you like, even an economic system. And you have to know all this, take it into account in politics, take account of people's ideas about good and evil, respect people's will, and take care of their freedom of conscience. Surely we have caused enough tragedy in the past, by destroying anything and everything, to have lost the desire to brandish hoary old ideological dogmas.

[Sevruk] How do you see the prospects for the country's emergence from the crisis, and what paths do you think should be chosen?

[Mutalibov] Yes, we must follow the path of reforms. Follow it boldly and firmly, but think carefully about every step and foresee its consequences. We cannot go on experimenting with millions of human lives. Still less can you change political, economic, and social programs as if you were shuffling a pack of cards. If you asked me what is the most important question today, I would answer briefly—the question of the masses' political confidence in the leadership of the country, of each republic, and of the specific collective. People are being educated by real political life, by their own firsthand experience. It is a pity that we have forgotten the principle of the first years of perestroyka: unity of word and deed. But we did not invent it. Every sensible and authoritative politician, businessman, and administrator is guided by this rule. When people see again and again that our main efforts go on slogans and decrees that nobody follows and nobody fulfills, the critical mass of public dissatisfaction could reach an explosive point. And it is no use fostering the illusion that just one more speech, one more decree will be enough, and then the people's confidence will be regained.

The agreement of the Ten generated great hopes and created the necessary political space for the formation of a renewed federal Union of Sovereign Soviet republics, for economic reform, for the strengthening of the authority of the law, and—I particularly wish to stress this—for the establishment of social and interethnic accord. If we follow the letter and spirit of this agreement, we will gain support, regain the people's confidence, and emerge from the crisis. If we hesitate again and try to evade the implacable logic of life, we will fail dismally. There is, as they say, no alternative.

Azerbaijan Approves Draft Union Treaty

LD2706222691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Text] [Announcer] The Union republics have begun discussing the draft Union treaty. One such discussion took place today at a session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet. Before the start of the debate our correspondent Islam Kuliyev spoke with Elmira Kafarova, chairman of the Republican Supreme Soviet.

[Begin Kafarova recording] This is the second time that we have debated the Union treaty at a session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet. The first occasion was a month ago, and our deputies made a great many comments which were put forward by the president of our republic, Ayaz Niyazovich Mutalibov, and were made known to the preparatory committee. And now, having received the text, the new text of the Union treaty, we can see that all our wishes have, in the main, been taken into consideration. This gives grounds for thinking that the Supreme Soviet will agree on the draft treaty, and, of course, it will be stated there that there are positions that have not been taken into account, and the plenipotentiary delegation which has been allocated to sign the treaty, headed by the republican president, will agree in the future separate points with other delegations. I say "agree" because nine republics, and the autonomous republics, are taking part in the treaty, and before signing one or another clause of the Union treaty there must, of course, be agreement between all members of the constituent union. [end recording]

[Announcer] Despite the fact that the draft treaty on the future union of nine sovereign states, which was drawn up in Novo-Ogarevo, took into consideration it would appear, the wishes of representatives of all the republics, on this occasion, too, the Azerbaijani parliamentarians made their own additions and proposals to this document. Taking them into acocunt, the draft union treaty was approved by a majority vote. The session continues its work tomorrow.

'Independent Azerbaijan' Against Union Treaty

OW2706052991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 26 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Azerbaijan's Supreme Soviet opened a session in Baku on Wednesday. The agenda has 11 points including: a debate on the draft Union Treaty, laws on electing the republic's President, the status of people's deputies, employment, freedom of worship, news media, and state policies on young people.

Before the session's opening the deputy from the "Independent Azerbaijan" bloc Etibar Mamedov declared that the presidential election appointed [as received] in the republic for September 8 cannot be held in conditions of an emergency situation still kept on in Baku.

On the draft Union Treaty Etibar mamedov pledged on behelf of his bloc to vote against signing it and to do their best to obtain a sovereign Azerbaijani state.

Newspaper Accuses Georgian Authorities of Bias

OW2806073091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The newspaper "Golos" (Voice) published by the Union of Soviet journalists has accused Georgian authorities of exerting pressure on independent periodicals in the republic. On Thursday the editor in-chief of "Golos" Igor Ilchin told newsmen in Moscow that "the allegedly democratic authorities of Georgia profess totalitarian ideology".

The paper's Tbilisi correspondent Giul Antelava says that in Georgia the press have experienced extensive pressure ever since the "Round Table-Free Georgia" bloc came to power. According to him, President Zviyad Gamsakhurdia views as his own enemies those newsmen whose stand is unbiased and critical.

5 Georgian reporters, G. Antelava among them, published an appeal in the number 22 issue of "Golos". They said that the authorities denied all of them access to inforamtion from Georgia's official sources. Newsmen and their families are subjected to harassment and threats.

The appeal calls for inviting to Tbilisi independent experts from international journalist and human-rights organizations. It is addressed to the International Helsinki Federation, to the International Organization of Journalists and to Georgia's President Zviyad Gamsakhurdia.

According to G. Antelava, pressure is exerted not only on those who signed the appeal, but also on reporters from the news agency TASS, "Megapolisexpress", "Nezavisimaya Gazeta" and other Russian-language periodicals.

This policy, says the Georgian reporter, reflects the attitude of the present Georgian authorities to the opposition in general.

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Approves Denationalization Program

LD2706164491 Alma-Ata Kazakh Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Excerpt] At the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]:

At the morning session of the Supreme Soviet today in accordance with the republic's constitution, the annual report was delivered by Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR. It was devoted to the most important matters of internal and external policy of the republic in the period which has passed, and also the programme of the first stage of denationalization and privatization of state property of Kazakhstan. The report will be published in the press. The president replied to numerous questions from the members. There was a debate. The Supreme Soviet basically approved the program for denationalization and privatization of state property of the Kazakh SSR for 1991-92, the first stage. It was deemed advisable to carry out further work on it, taking account of the observations and proposals expressed by the deputies. It was decided to set up a joint group of parliament and government to work out a specific mechanism to implement this program. [passage omitted]

Kazakh Parliament Debates New Media Law

PM2706133191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Eduard Matskevich under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Helping Newspapers Survive"]

[Text] During the Kazakhstan parliament's discussion of the draft Law "On the Press and Other Mass Media," deputies made a proposal to open an appropriate ministry in the republic.

This proposal can be specifically attributed to the fact that the activities of over 250 periodical publications which come out in the republic, as well as the activities of their printing houses, are dependent on all-powerful committees and organizations. Newspapers and journals are finding it increasingly difficult to resist the arbitrary paper prices and the mail department's growing appetite. Furthermore, currently it will not be easy to coordinate and control the implementation of the proposed law, which affects the interests of virtually all sections of the population.

Only 14 of the 42 proposed articles have been borrowed from the Union Law on the Press. The rest have either been substantially amended or make new provisions proposed in conformity with the republic's sovereignty. For example, the law notes that a journalist working in

Kazakhstan is obliged to respect the legal rights, interests, and national dignity of its citizens. An article on the accreditation of representatives of Union publications has also been introduced.

K. Smailov, secretary of the Journalists Union Board, drew the parliamentarians' attention to the disastrous situation of press employees, the unreliability of legal guarantees and social protection for them, the freezing of fee payments, the lack of organizational technology and housing benefits, and so on.

Kyrgyz President Assesses Union Treaty

LD2706175791 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 27 Jun 91

[By correspondent Boris Maineyev]

[Text] Bishkek June 27 TASS—President Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan highly assessed the draft of a Union treaty in a speech at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic today.

"The draft treaty has managed to draw on everything that is valuable in the theory and world practice of federalism and confederacy," Akayev said. "We did not follow rigid schemes but created totally new structures. The renewed union will be a fundamentally new political and economic association of sovereign states. It is extremely important that the sovereignty of the republics is sealed in two aspects: domestic (sovereignty on its territory) and external (independence in world affairs taking account of the interests of the union). The division of powers between the signatories of the treaty and the new Union bodies is exclusively based on the interests of republics (economic, political, humanitarian)."

"The draft treaty aims at creating a new, genuinely Union, inter-republican centre, subordinate to the republics," the president continued. "Over and above it, the draft provides for widely developing direct ties of economic, political, and humanitarian nature between the republics".

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan approved by a majority of votes the draft Union treaty and set up a commission empowered to sign the Union treaty on behalf of the Republic.

Kyrgyz Supreme Soviet Endorses Draft Treaty

PM2706125591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev under general headline "At Soviet Sessions": "Kyrgyzstan"]

[Text] Bishkek, 26 Jun—An extraordinary session of the Kyrgyz Supreme Soviet which has opened here has approved the draft treaty on the union of sovereign states. The considerable rights which the republics will gain from it by uniting in a renewed voluntary federation were noted. The composition of the plenipotentiary delegation headed by Kyrgyz President A. Akayev—who will sign the final text of the treaty—was ratified.

Currently there is a heated debate under way at the session about the package of laws paving the way for radical economic reforms and the transition to market relations.

Tajikistan Supreme Soviet Adopts Citizenship Law

LD2706161891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 27 Jun 91

[Text] Dushanbe, 27 Jun (TASS)—The adoption of a republican law on citizenship is a major step toward building a democratic law- governed state. Today, the parliament of this Soviet Central Asian Republic ratified a draft law guaranteeing civil rights for all the republic's inhabitants irrespective of their origin, social and property situation, racial and national affiliation, place of residence and length of residence on the territory of the Republic, TAJIKTA correspondent Galina Gridneva reports.

In accordance with a similar Union legal enactment, a citizen of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] is at the same time a citizen of the USSR. Moreover, the status of citizen of Tajikistan can be acquired by persons arriving subsequently in the Republic for permanent residence. Citizens of other Union republics enjoy equal rights with the indigenous inhabitants on the territory of Tajikistan. The new law also protects the rights and interests of citizens of the Tajik SSR who are outside the republic's boundaries.